3 1761 05972894 9

HANDBOUND
AT THE

9784 I

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF JAMES MARTINEAU

Watts. Hollyer

James Martineau.

1876-7.

THE

LIFE AND LETTERS OF JAMES MARTINEAU

BY

JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D., LITT.D.
PRINCIPAL OF MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

C. B. UPTON, B.A., B.Sc.
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

990H
31/5/13

London
JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED
21 BERNERS STREET
1902

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF JAMES MARTINEAU

BY

JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D., LITT.D
PRINCIPAL OF MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

C. B. UPTON, B.A., B.Sc
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

5'990H
31/8/03

London
JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED
21 BERNERS STREET
1902

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co.
At the Ballantyne Press

PREFACE TO BOOK I

THE LIFE AND LETTERS

When I was asked by the family of the late Dr. Martineau to write the purely biographical portion of the composite work which is here presented in its completeness, it was with considerable trepidation that I undertook a task for which I was conscious of no special aptitude, but which I at once felt it to be impossible to decline. With the aid of material abundantly supplied or carefully collected, both in print and manuscript, I have constructed a tale unadorned except by inserted fragments of writing from the pen of Dr. Martineau, and can claim no higher merit than presenting to the reader the leading facts of a busy and noble life with clearness and accuracy. A portion of the narrative has the advantage of being autobiographical; for Dr. Martineau wrote a series of "Biographical Memoranda" to assist his friend the Rev. Charles Wicksteed in the preparation of a short Memoir for the "National Portrait Gallery," published by Messrs. Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, in 1877. Considerable portions of these were used, often with very slight verbal changes, by Mr. Wicksteed; but, with the ready consent of the firm, the greater part of these Memoranda now appears in the original form, a good deal being included which Mr. Wicksteed did not find suit-

able for his purpose. Occasionally I have used them simply for material, and this fact may explain any appearance of plagiarism from the account in the "Portrait Gallery."

The circumstances of Dr. Martineau's life have rendered it necessary to give a detailed account of some transactions which may have little interest for the general public, but had the highest importance for himself and his friends. On the other hand, considerations of space have obliged me to omit many things which those who were personally associated with him might have wished to include. Especially has it been necessary to make rather a severe selection from the great mass of letters placed at my disposal. I have tried to select those which are most characteristic, and throw most light upon his thought; and I must crave the indulgence of many for having omitted letters which to themselves must have been peculiarly valuable. To several correspondents I must make my grateful acknowledgments for the ready kindness and courtesy with which they have imparted information or supplied me with material, or permitted me to make use of letters of which they were custodians. In one or two instances I have ventured, without authorisation, to insert or to quote from an ancient letter, having failed to discover any representatives of the recipients to give the customary sanction, but have included nothing to which I thought exception could possibly be taken.

I have not thought it the duty of a biographer to express his own sentiments or opinions, and have aimed only at producing a true narrative, leaving to others the work of analysis and criticism. The name of James Martineau has been with me a household word since my childhood.

PREFACE TO BOOK I

The spiritual character of his thought fascinated me at an early period; and when I became his pupil, I admired and revered him with all the ardour of opening manhood. And if, yielding to his own lessons of independent judgment, I have been unable to follow him in all his conclusions, or if in my descriptions I have endeavoured to suppress all personal feeling, this cannot alter the reverence, gratitude, and love with which he must ever dwell in my memory.

JAMES DRUMMOND

OXFORD, May 14, 1902.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I

BOOK I

LIFE AND LETTERS

Chapter		Page
I.	Childhood and Early Home, 1805–1814	1
II.	Education, 1815–1827	16
III.	First Settlement and Beginning of Ministerial Life, 1827–1832	44
IV.	Paradise Street, 1832–1848	71
V.	The Continent, 1848–1849	181
VI.	Hope Street, 1849–1857	194
VII.	Professorship in London, 1857–1869	351

Book I

LIFE AND LETTERS

From an engraving of a painting by Mr. Agar

JAMES MARTINEAU
1847-8

LIFE OF DR. MARTINEAU

Chapter I

CHILDHOOD AND EARLY HOME, 1805–1814

In the city of Norwich there is a narrow thoroughfare bearing the name of Magdalen Street, wherein stands a plain brick house of three stories, bearing the number 24. The front of this house, which faces eastwards, abuts upon the footway, and is truly described as "prosaic to the last degree";[1] but the interior is commodious and comfortable. Each of the shafts which project from the jambs of the hall door now presents to the eye of the curious visitor the name of "Martineau House." To the left of the house is an arched passage wide enough for carts, which winds round the rear, and gives access to some works which project behind the buildings in the street. The dwelling-house is thus separated from its small and narrow garden, which is entered by a gate opening from the little lane. This garden now wears a dingy and neglected appearance, but may well have been more attractive in the early part of the last century. If the visitor, returning from the garden, ascend to the top rooms, he may obtain glimpses of Mousehold Heath between the chimneys and gables of the opposite houses, and on looking obliquely to the right will obtain a fine view of the beautiful tower and spire of the cathedral. The situation is conveniently near the principal

[1] "Harriet Martineau's Autobiography, with Memorials by Maria Weston Chapman," 3 vols., 1877; I. p. 184. (This work will be cited as H. M. Aut.)

part of the city; and not far off, in an adjoining street, is the Octagon Chapel, where Dr. Taylor advocated his broad and unsectarian Christianity. It was in this house in Magdalen Street that on the 21st of April, 1805, a little girl, not quite three years old, was admitted to the best bedroom, and with some awe and trepidation crossed the polished floor, and took her seat beside "an unknown old woman, in a mob cap," who placed across her knees a bundle of flannel, and, opening it, displayed the tiny face of a baby.[1] The little girl was Harriet Martineau, and the baby was her brother James. These two were the sixth and seventh children, James being the fourth son; and the family circle was completed by the birth of an eighth, a daughter, named Ellen, in 1811.

The name of Martineau indicates a French descent. It is said that the earliest known Martineau was Louis, who was apprenticed to one of the original printers of Germany, and afterwards established at the Sorbonne one of the first printing presses in France. He married a German Lutheran, and through this connection his descendants became Protestants.[2] The revocation of the Edict of Nantes on the 22d of October, 1685, led to a considerable migration of French Protestants into England; and among others Gaston Martineau, a surgeon of Dieppe, removed to Norwich. He married a French lady named Pierre, so that at first the family retained the purity of its foreign extraction. The profession of this founder of the English branch of the Martineaus became to some extent hereditary. In the records of the French Church at Norwich we twice meet with the name of David Martineau entered as that of an eminent surgeon.[3] Philip Meadows Martineau, the uncle of James, was also distinguished; and within the

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 13 *sq.*

[2] From a manuscript note among the Martineau papers.

[3] Both died young, aged 32 and 42. Smiles, "Huguenots," p. 488.

family in Magdalen Street the eldest son devoted himself to the ancestral calling.

It is interesting to know something of the parentage of two such remarkable people as have given a lasting distinction to the name of Martineau. Their father, Thomas, was the youngest of a large family, and carried on the business of a bombazine and camlet manufacturer, and, it seems, did some little business also in the importation of wine for his friends.[1] He is described as "a man of more tenderness and moral refinement than force of self-assertion," [2] and his daughter speaks of him as "the most unselfish of men, who never spoke of his own feelings, and always considered other people's." "In our remembrance of him," she says, "there is no pain on the ground of anything in his character. Humble, simple, upright, self-denying, affectionate to as many people as possible, and kindly to all, he gave no pain, and did all the good he could. He had not the advantage of an adequate education; but there was a natural shrewdness about him which partly compensated for the want. He was not the less, but the more, anxious to give his children the advantages which he had never received; and the whole family have always felt that they owe a boundless debt of gratitude to both their parents for the self-sacrificing efforts they made, through all the vicissitudes of the times, to fit their children in the best possible manner for independent action in life." [3]

Mr. Thomas Martineau married Elizabeth Rankin, the eldest daughter of Mr. Robert Rankin, a wholesale grocer and sugar-refiner, of Newcastle upon Tyne. She "was perhaps the most capable member of a family whose standard

[1] Dr. Martineau calls him a "wine-merchant" in his "Biographical Memoranda" written in 1877; but I am told that this, without explanation, gives rather an incorrect impression. — J. D.

[2] Bi. Mem.

[3] H. M. Aut., I. p. 127.

of ability and character was above the average. Of great energy and quickness of resource . . . she naturally played the chief part in the government of the household, though always supported by the authority and admiration of her husband. Her children were trained in wholesome habits and clever arts, and stimulated by her sparkling talk." [1] Speaking from recollection in his old age Dr. Martineau gives the following description of his mother: "Her understanding was clear, and her will, with a duty once in sight, not to be diverted; but behind these, and giving them their direction, was an inexhaustible force of affection; and not behind them only, but glowing through them in her expressive features and fervent words. A slight and delicate portrait of her is before me, from the pencil of a young artist friend [2] who had an eye to read her truly; and no one can fail to see that its calm dignity is but the momentary composure of a countenance moulded by emotion, and often tremulous with pity and with love." Her "quickness of feeling extended, no doubt, to her temper, so far as to render her displeasure at wrong emphatic, and to warn us also, if we did not wish to be laughed at, to do nothing awkward or stupid under her eye. But it secured no less the praise of well-doing, and a bright response to whatever was generous and noble." And so he looked back with unalterable reverence and affection to his "true and tender-hearted mother — a woman of rare capacity, nobleness, and wisdom." [3] Mrs. James Martineau, in a letter to her sister, written on the 22d of November, 1838, speaks with the greatest pleasure of her intercourse with her mother-in-law, who was then on a visit in Liverpool, and says, "She is a glorious woman, and I delight in her as much as ever." In 1836, when Harriet Martineau re-

[1] Bi. Mem.
[2] Mr. Hilary Bonham Carter, who had a great admiration for her.
[3] Letter to the "Daily News," Dec. 30, 1884.

From a sketch by *Miss Hilary Bonham-Carter*

DR. MARTINEAU'S MOTHER
1845-6

turned from America, Mrs. Martineau was a guest at Mount Street in Liverpool, and a letter of the time dwells with delight on Harriet's visit, and on her mother's pride in her, "looking as if her every wish were fulfilled."

It would not, however, be just to conceal the fact that a different kind of portrait has been drawn of this confessedly talented lady, and that occasionally timid and sensitive young people regarded her decided ways with some alarm. This, however, was not a universal experience, as the following extract from a letter of Mrs. Wilde's will show: —

"Surely never was any parent more imbued with Motherly love. It was she who brought your talents all forth, and made you what you were. She was particularly and deservedly proud of your brother Tom, Harriet, and yourself. Well do I remember you a little fellow, in nankeen frock, standing at her knee, engaged with her in a tiresome little housekeeping job. The little fingers ached, and the spirit flagged, when suddenly the lisping voice repeated two lines of a well-known hymn, and you resumed your work with renewed energy. She took no notice to you, but looked up to me with eyes brimming over with tears, as seeing the future man in that childlike determination. I was a great deal at Norwich from the age of twelve to eighteen, first at school and afterwards on visits; and though I was received with great kindness by all three of my aunts, it was in Magdalen Street that I felt the most at my ease. I, shy, stupid girl that I was, was never afraid of your mother." [1]

But it is frequently the case with clever people that principles of conduct which are entirely kind and unselfish are concealed by the decision and promptness of their actions,

---

[1] Letter to Dr. Martineau, Dec. 31, 1884. It is said that the lines were from Mrs. Barbauld's hymn: —

"The man of Calvary triumphed here; —
Why should his faithful followers fear?"

Other letters, written by different people about the same time, containing recollections of her, bear testimony to her brightness and lovableness, combined with weight of moral and intellectual character.

and that in consequence they are sometimes greatly misjudged. Within the household in Magdalen Street the severity of Puritan training still lingered, though perhaps it was less marked than in some other families; and Harriet Martineau, who was an abnormally sensitive child, delicate in health, and always longing for demonstrative tokens of affection, chafed against this strictness. It is easy to collect from the pages of her Autobiography passages which, taken by themselves, give a repellent picture of her mother; but this is unjust both to the mother and to the daughter, and the Autobiography as a whole does not lay the latter open to the charge of disloyalty and ingratitude to which injudicious friends have exposed her. That there was a difference of temperament which, especially in Harriet's childhood, prevented a mutual understanding, does not lay either of them open to blame. According to the Autobiography the gentle and unselfish father was likewise unable to read the heart of the young genius committed to his care. "I doubt," says Miss Martineau, "whether they [her parents] ever had the slightest idea of my miseries. It seems to me now that a little closer observation would have shown them the causes of the bad health and fitful temper which gave them so much anxiety on my account."[1] At a later time, when the girl was growing to maturity, she says, under the year 1820: "My mother, too, took me into her confidence more and more as my mind opened, and, I may add, as my deafness increased, and bespoke for me her motherly sympathy. For some years, indeed, there was a genuine and cordial friendship between my mother and me, which was a benefit to me in all manner of ways; and, from the time when I began to have literary enterprises (and quite as much before I obtained success as after) I was sustained by her

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 11.

trustful, generous, self-denying sympathy and maternal appreciation. After a time, when she was fretted by cares and infirmities, I became as nervous in regard to her as ever (even to the entire breaking down of my health); but during the whole period of which I am now treating — (and it is a very large space in my life) — there were no limitations to our mutual confidence."[1] Again, she says, "there was a close mutual reliance between my mother and myself," and they used to read and walk together.[2] This "kind mother"[3] was "always generous in money matters."[4] On Aug. 28, 1831, Harriet writes: "Oh my mother, one of the greatest joys I have in success is in your share of my pleasure and gratitude";[5] and she cordially acknowledges that, in regard to the subjects to be included in her books, her mother "was thoroughly sound in doctrine, and just and generous in practice."[6] A few simple words show how warm was the affection between them. They met in Liverpool on Miss Martineau's return from her journey in the East. Mrs. Martineau had been prejudiced by her daughter's connection with mesmerism; but, says the latter, "I knew that the sound of my voice, and my mere presence for five minutes, would put to flight all objections to my mode of recovery: and we did meet and part in comfort and satisfaction."[7] These few extracts are given, not in order to disturb the ashes of an old controversy, but for the double purpose of completing the portrait of Mrs. Martineau and doing justice to the memory of a great and noble woman, who, through a large part of her life, was so strongly attached to the subject of this memoir.[8]

---

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 98 *sq.* [2] *Ib.*, I. p. 126. [3] *Ib.*, I. p. 161.
[4] *Ib.*, I. p. 143. [5] *Ib.*, III. p. 53. [6] *Ib.*, II. p. 163.
[7] *Ib.*, II. p. 317.

[8] In the above remarks it may seem to be assumed that Miss H. Martineau's less favourable judgments were founded on accurate recollections. But there is ample reason for believing that her memory was coloured by her later mood.

The following account of her parents, from the educational point of view, is given by the youngest daughter, Mrs. Higginson: "It is certain that my father and mother knew no language but their own, at least within our memory; yet I cannot remember a time when there was not much reading going on in the family circle, and not only *duty* reading, but discussion and literary talk, and ours was one of the Norwich houses which held in friendship, more or less close, the men and women who bore the names of Taylor, Alderson, Opie, Smith (Sir James E.), Rigby, Enfield, Reeve and Austin; also Houghton and Madge. My father was a plain, business man . . .; he had passed some portion of his childhood under the roof of the Barbaulds, and if he did not bring away much learning from them, I like to indulge the belief that from Mrs. Barbauld he acquired the strong political leanings, and the firm principles of Nonconformity, that marked his after citizenship, and certainly descended in no equivocal way to his sons and daughters. . . . I believe that to my mother we must trace the beginnings of literary culture in our household. She had enjoyed perhaps fewer educational advantages, early in life, than her husband had done, but she had quick perceptions, indomitable energy, and wonderful tact in making the most of opportunities. One of her brothers (John Rankin, father of Mrs. Henry Turner) was more or less intimate with Robert Burns, and my mother was an enthusiastic admirer of Burns' poetry, and of all she could learn of Scotland. When no longer a child, she was allowed to have lessons from a Mr. Storey, who

Dr. Martineau, writing to his cousin Mrs. Turner, on Jan. 7, 1885, says: "I do not think that anyone but myself, who have just gone over all the boy and girl correspondence, as well as that of later years, from my 15th to my 42nd year, can appreciate the extent to which Harriet's ultimate mood and estimates of things transformed and distorted her seeming memories of early life. The limitation of her external senses reduced her outward experience to a fainter impressiveness than that of her vivid ideal states; so that the intense dreams and contrasts of the present eclipsed and modified the images of the past."

was probably an elegant scholar. She used to name this as the *one* educational advantage of her life, and she must have then been introduced to Shakespeare, Milton, Pope's Translations, and some general historical reading. The opportunity was short, but its results have been felt by us all. The love of literature once awakened, my mother seems never to have lost the habit of adding to her store of knowledge, and snatches of reading must have carried her through many trials, from her first being transplanted to what was, to her, the cold and haughty South, through the anxieties of rearing a large family by means of a fluctuating and finally ruinous business. This measure of self-education enabled her to give life to the early lessons of her children, to direct the choice of teachers for them, to collect intelligent people about them, and to give a warm and appreciative sympathy to them in their subsequent literary efforts. So far, it was all Literature: — Science was at a discount in Norwich and especially with the Martineaus." [1]

In his early days James Martineau, though possessing a more robust constitution, seems to have had the same highly strung and serious temperament as his sister, and to have been regarded as a delicate child, "unusually grave and thoughtful." [2] He was thin and sallow, and is said to have been timid, and even nervous. A friend speaks of him as "an irritable child," [3] and he himself confesses that his childhood was not happy. He attributes this "not to any sharp or repressive discipline" on the part of his father or mother, "but to well-meant yet persecuting sport" on the part of his older brothers, "and to the rough treatment of a great public school; and still more to the simple absence of any apprehensive sympathy with the growing inner life of the boy." [4] However, the strangely gifted boy and girl, suffering under the pressure of their own undeveloped

[1] From MS. "Notes," written in 1875.
[2] MS. Reminiscence of a friend.
[3] H. M. Aut., III. p. 11.
[4] Bi. Mem.

genius, were devoted companions to one another. Harriet relates how, when she was about five years old, she managed one morning to get her little brother out of bed to witness a crimson and purple sunrise. "The sky was gorgeous," she says, "and I talked very religiously to the child."[1] On another occasion, having learned that the world was a globe swimming in space, the children began to dig in the little plots appropriated to them in the garden. They intended to make a hole through the globe, till they came out at the other side; but soon coming on some impenetrable brickbats they altered their plan, and extended the hole to their own length, "having an extreme desire to know what dying was like." They lay down alternately in this grave, shut their eyes, and fancied themselves dead, and told one another their feelings when they came out again. "As far as I can remember," says Miss Martineau, "we fully believed that we now knew all about it."[2] A family tradition relates that one Sunday, at dinner time, James was found seated on a little stool, with a great Bible resting on a chair. "He was eager to know which chapter in Isaiah he was reading, and announced that he had read from the beginning of Genesis to that place 'since Chapel.' On his mother's rebuking him for the exaggeration, he promptly added, 'skipping the nonsense, you know, Mamma.'"[3]

James' own earliest recollection is of a journey to Newcastle upon Tyne, to stay with his grandfather. In 1809 the journey had to be made in a post-chaise, and occupied about four days. The party consisted of Mrs. Martineau, "dear, pretty, gentle Aunt Margaret," sister Elizabeth, aged fifteen, Rachel, Harriet, and the little child of four.

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 17 *sq.*

[2] *Ib.*, I. p. 58 *sq.* Referred to also in "Life in the Sick Room," p. 100 (3d ed.), 1849.

[3] From Mrs. Higginson's MS. Notes. Another form of the tradition says that he had been told to read in Isaiah, and proclaimed that he had read through the book.

The last named, clad in nankeen frocks, was placed on a low stool, and rode backwards, so that the chief impression left on his mind was one of misery and sickness. He remembered also the awe with which he looked on Durham Cathedral. The time was enlivened by a little quiet romping, and a great deal of story telling by the aunt. At the Forth, Mr. Rankin's place at Newcastle, the children suffered "through the lying intrigues of an over-favoured cousin," who brought upon them imputations of stealing the fruit, and caused them to be shut out of the garden. They both remembered this event with a deep sense of injury. As Dr. Martineau says, "the first burning sense of injustice, I suppose, is never forgotten." The elder child, however, records some pleasanter experiences, which, even if he forgot them, may have left their impression on the tender mind of the boy. "Good Mr. Turner of Newcastle" had been Mrs. Martineau's pastor and friend before her marriage, and they usually went to have tea at his house on Sunday evenings. The rest may be given in Miss Martineau's words: "Another religious impression that we children brought from Newcastle is very charming to me still. Our gentle, delicate Aunt Mary, whom I remember so well in her white gown, with her pink colour, thin silky brown hair, and tender manner towards us, used to get us round her knees as she sat in the window-seat at the Forth, where the westerly sun shone, and teach us to sing Milton's hymn, 'Let us with a gladsome mind.' It is the very hymn for children, set to its own simple tune; and I always, to this day, hear Aunt Mary's weak, earnest voice in it." [1]

Of the religious influences of the home we have no detailed information; but we hear of the children learning "Mrs. Barbauld's Prose Hymns" by heart,[2] and the sincere

[1] Bi. Mem., and H. M. Aut., I. p. 28 *sqq.*
[2] H. M. Aut., I. p. 34.

and practical, if somewhat reserved and silent, piety of a Unitarian household of that day must have appealed to the tender conscience of the boy, and planted within him the seeds of that spiritual faith which characterized his later life. The influence of the chapel which the family attended must not be overlooked; for Dr. Martineau himself referred to it with gratitude in later years. The Octagon Chapel, so called from its peculiar form, was built for Dr. John Taylor, who, in his sermon at the opening on the 12th of May, 1756, declared that "we are Christians, and only Christians. . . . We disown all connection, except that of love and good-will, with any sect or party whatever, . . . so that we may exercise the public duties of Religion upon the most catholic and charitable foundation." During Dr. Martineau's infancy the Rev. Pendlebury Houghton was the minister of this chapel, and by maintaining its liberal traditions succeeded in keeping together a congregation which, while united in devotion, was by no means of one mind in theological doctrine. A change, however, took place before we can suppose the mind of the child to have been impressed by the spectacle of this catholic communion, the tradition of which remained so dear to him through life. In 1811 the Rev. Thomas Madge was invited to Norwich as co-pastor with Mr. Houghton, and in 1812 became the sole minister, and exercised a marked influence on the religious life of a large congregation till, in 1825, he removed to Essex Street in London. Mr. Madge had been brought up as a member of the Church of England; but having become convinced of the truth of Unitarianism, and believing this alone to be the genuine gospel of Christ, he thought it his duty to proclaim it with greater distinctness than had hitherto been the practice at Norwich, thereby causing some secessions, and imparting to the congregation greater uniformity of theological colour. Many must still survive who remember the silvery tones, and the sweet and earnest face,

of the venerable preacher in Essex Street Chapel. He was a man of sincere and cheerful piety, of strong convictions, with a keen eye for all that is pure and beautiful in the Christian message, if not equally able to penetrate the deeper problems of the spirit, with a warm and kindly heart, easily roused to indignation, and as easily appeased, a man to be loved and honoured for the simplicity and guilelessness of a mind always faithful to its own vision, and uncorrupted by success. Miss Harriet Martineau speaks rather disdainfully of his intellectual powers, though not insensible to the charm of his character. His "sermons," she says, "conveyed few clear ideas to children, though much sweet and solemn impression." [1] The heart of the boy seems to have been more open to his influence. In a speech at the dedication of Hope Street Church in 1849 Mr. Martineau said, in referring to the sermon which Mr. Madge preached on that occasion: "I cannot describe to any one who is not keenly alive to the recollections of early life the kind of emotions which the tones of that dear voice awaken in me." [2] And, again, he wrote to Mrs. Madge, after the death of her husband: "Such purity and simplicity of heart, such earnest depth of devout conviction, a habit of thought so clear and firm, of expression so lucid, of speech so winning, were blended in him, as to render him unique among his contemporaries. No doubt, in my case, early impressions of a very tender and sacred kind have something to do with the affectionate veneration with which I regarded him; for some of my first awakenings of conscience and of spiritual faith came to me in the tones of that sweet voice, and the inward echoes were ever renewed when I heard it again, in preaching or in prayer." [3] Mr. Madge's influence

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 33.

[2] Quoted from the "Christian Reformer," in the Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Madge, by the Rev. W. James, 1871, p. 194 *sq.*

[3] *Ib.*, p. 323 *sq.*

was not confined to the pulpit. He and other friends were frequently invited to supper on Sunday evenings by Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Martineau, "at whose hospitable board there was an ample feast of reason and flow of soul. Mr. Madge, after his pulpit labours were over, seemed always fresh and ready to impart the most lively interest to the subjects which had occupied his and our attention during the day. This weekly gathering afforded a very delightful close to each Sunday evening." [1]

Of other home influences we have little record. Of his lessons at home during childhood Dr. Martineau says he remembers nothing.[2] We are told, however, that his parents "gave their children, girls as well as boys, an education of a very high order, including sound classical instruction and training." [3] At that time Norwich was distinguished by a regard for literature, which was more than an affectation, though Miss H. Martineau writes scornfully of the pedantry and vulgarity by which it was accompanied.[4] Whatever may have been its intrinsic merits, it must have helped to stimulate the taste for intellectual pursuits, and to foster the higher tastes and sensibilities. Music, too, was cultivated. Mrs. Martineau loved music;[5] and Dr. Martineau, who may have attended the Gate-House Concerts at Norwich, and who once gave utterance to the rather hard saying that no one should be a minister who was not musical, might be seen, up to his latest years, in the full enjoyment of concerts in London.

There was sometimes a visit from a lady, not resident in Norwich, of whose literary distinction there could be no doubt; and this chapter may conclude with a charming picture from Miss H. Martineau's Autobiography: "There

---

[1] Memoir of Madge, p. 107, quoted from a communication written by Mr. J. Withers Dowson.

[2] Bi. Mem.

[3] H. M. Aut., III. p. 293.

[4] *Ib.*, I. p. 297 *sqq.*

[5] *Ib.*, I. p. 54.

was one occasional apparition which kept alive in us a sense of what intellectual superiority ought to be and to produce. Mrs. Barbauld came to Norwich now and then; and she always made her appearance presently at our house. In her early married life, before the happiness of the devoted wife was broken up by her gentle husband's insanity, she had helped him in his great school at Palgrave in Suffolk, by taking charge of the very little boys. William Taylor and my father had stood at her knee with their slates; and when they became men, and my father's children were older than he was when she first knew him, she retained her interest in him, and extended it to my mother and us. It was a remarkable day for us when the comely elderly lady in her black silk cloak and bonnet came and settled herself for a long morning chat. . . . Well I remember her gentle lively voice, and the stamp of superiority on all she said. We knew she was very learned, and we saw she was graceful, and playful, and kindly, and womanly." [1]

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 302.

Chapter II

EDUCATION, 1815–1827

WITHIN the spacious Cathedral Close at Norwich, on the left hand as the visitor enters through a noble gateway opposite the western door of the nave, stands an ancient Grammar School, where some of the men whose names are distinguished in English history once pursued their studies. For a few years it was presided over by Dr. Samuel Parr, who was celebrated for his classical attainments; but on his retirement in 1786 it fell into feebler hands, and the number of scholars was seriously reduced. In 1810 the appointment of Mr. Edward Valpy to the head-mastership retrieved its failing fortunes, so that pupils were attracted even from distant parts of the country, and it became necessary to engage three additional houses to provide sufficient accommodation. Into this large and miscellaneous school James Martineau was introduced as a day scholar at the early age of ten, and he remained there for about four years (1815-1819). The standard of classical attainment was more than respectable, and the practice, then new, was adopted of using an *English* Latin Grammar. The impressions which the school left upon the mind of the sensitive boy may be given in his own words: —

"I left it before reaching its highest form; but not without having made fair progress in Latin, and a good start in Greek; though my reading in the latter was as yet limited to Homer and Xenophon. Among my 230 school-fellows were several who afterwards rose to distinction in civil or military life: James Brooke, Rajah of Sarawak; Stodart, who perished with Conolly in Bokhara; George Borrow,

the writer and actor of romance; Edward Rigby and John Dalrymple, eminent practitioners of the medical art. The last three were my companions in study and in play: and of the first two, who were two or three years older, I have a clear remembrance, especially of Stodart's tall figure and calm commanding face. In spite of school friendships, however, those years of boyhood were not bright. The day scholars were despised by the boarders; and there were big tyrants among themselves, who, especially if they were blockheads, bullied the weaker boys into saving them trouble and doing their work: and though I did not shrink from a race or a battle with a competitor fairly matched, I suffered keenly under the smart of hopeless oppression and unmerited insult. The studies also of which I was naturally most fond, — the mathematical, — were kept in a tantalising subordination: so that, when I had learned enough to feel my own backwardness in them, I became restive under my narrow opportunities for their pursuit. Our teacher in geometry, — a Mr. Priest, — was not a very popular personage with the boys in general any more than Euclid himself would have been. But to me the image of the grave and taciturn man, with somewhat stooping figure, bald head, and suffering face, is grateful from its association with awakening tastes and helpful impulse." [1]

It will be seen from the above extract how strongly the repulsive picture of the public school system, which he presents in his essay on Dr. Arnold, was coloured by the unfavourable recollections of his own experience.[2] His sister, Mrs. Higginson, who, as a child, was devoted to her schoolboy brother, relates that he was removed from the Grammar School because there were several boys whose companionship was not deemed advantageous, and he was placed for a time under the direction of Mr. Madge, who consented to receive him as a private pupil for some hours in the week. His new teacher was full of enthusiasm for Wordsworth, and, finding his pupil's taste and imagination

[1] Bi. Mem.

[2] "Essays, Reviews, and Addresses," I. p. 68, 1890. Henceforth referred to as Essays.

unawakened, he partially displaced Greek and Latin, and put him on a course of reading in the Arabian Nights and Mrs. Leicester's School. At this time he used tools and practised turning.[1]

A greater change was now at hand. The Rev. Dr. Lant Carpenter, the father of the well-known physiologist and of Miss Mary Carpenter, had settled in Bristol in the summer of 1817. He there continued the practice, which he had begun at Exeter in 1805, of keeping a small boarding school. Harriet Martineau spent fifteen months, from February, 1818, at a school kept by her aunt, Mrs. Robert Rankin, at Bristol, and at the end of that period brought home an enthusiastic account of the influence over her of Dr. Carpenter's classes and pulpit services. The result was that Mr. Thomas Martineau determined to find the hundred guineas a year which would make his son one of Dr. Carpenter's dozen pupils, and for two years, 1819-1821, the growing mind of the boy came under a very remarkable moral and religious influence. His new teacher, unlike Mr. Madge, had spent his early life in the midst of Unitarian associations; but his piety was no less deep and fervent, his sense of duty was strict and methodical, and his power of swaying the hearts and wills of young people was of a very unusual kind, resting on the personal persuasiveness and obvious sincerity of his own fine character. Harriet Martineau, in her Autobiography, speaks scornfully of him as "superficial in his knowledge, scanty in ability, narrow in his conceptions, and thoroughly priestly in his temper." But she confesses that he was worshipped by the young, and by none more than by herself; and "his power was unbounded while his pupils continued young."[2] These words, however, were written under the influence of her revolt against what, in her later years, she regarded as meta-

[1] MS. Notes.

[2] I. p. 95.

physical superstition. Her brother never lost his reverence for his old teacher. In the memoranda written when he was upwards of seventy he still speaks of his association with Dr. Carpenter as an "inestimable privilege"; and in a long letter written to the Rev. R. L. Carpenter in 1841 he records most gratefully, though not without discrimination, the impressions left upon him by his school days in Bristol. A few passages may be transcribed from this letter, as throwing light upon the development of his own mind: —

"So forcibly, indeed, did that period act upon me, — so visibly did it determine the subsequent direction of my mind and lot, that it always stands before me as the commencement of my present life, making me feel like a man without a childhood; and though a multitude of earlier scenes are still in view, they seem to be spread around a different being, and to belong, like the incidents of a dream, to some foreign self that became extinct when the morning light of reality broke upon the sight. I need not dwell on the illusory nature of this feeling. It is obvious enough that in no one's case can there really occur such an abrupt termination of one series of causes, and sudden replacement by another; that the years before I knew your father, prepared me to love and venerate him as I did, and set before him a boy ready to be penetrated and fused into new forms by his extraordinary influence; than which I can give them no higher praise. Still, the illusion itself . . . is evidence of a wonderful power, rare even among the best instructors, of commanding the reverence, and reconstituting the wills, of the least manageable class of human beings."

"Profound *moral feeling* . . . was the great primary force of his whole mind; transcending and directing not only his intellectual gifts, but (if it is possible to separate and compare what in him were so absolutely blended) even his religious affections. I have never seen in any human being the idea of duty, the feeling of right, held in such visible reverence."

"I should say that the specific want of your father's mind was in his faint perception of beauty. He had little appreciation of Art, as such, and apart from the moral purposes which may be associated with it; and though not without a delight, occasionally vivid, in poetry, music, and painting, he evidently experienced in this only the pleasure reflected

from the higher affections, and was a stranger to the genuine æsthetic emotions."

"Around the dinner-table . . . he read the daily papers to us, and made the parliamentary debates the vehicle for his fine lessons of constitutional knowledge and political wisdom . . . I shall never forget how the Manchester massacre kindled his generous indignation; drew forth his stores of constitutional history in eloquent defence of the popular right of petition; and suggested to him great maxims of civil freedom. And the sentences of Grattan's final speech in behalf of the Catholic claims still ring in my memory, as they flowed from your father's fervent lips, and thrilled into me my first and last true love of the principles of religious liberty."

"The directly religious instruction of the school, in all respects admirable, owed its efficacy chiefly to the quality to which, in truth, all power on earth is given, viz., its deep and absolute sincerity. . . . The historical, geographical, and archæological knowledge brought together for the illustration of the Scriptures, presented their incidents before us with a clearness and reality very difficult to attain. The critical reading of the Greek Testament every Monday morning gradually accumulated an amount of theological information, respecting both the text and the interpretation of the sacred writings, rarely placed within the reach of any but divines. And the lessons on natural religion and ethical philosophy displayed to us the two great lines of connection by which God stands perceptibly related to this world; — the physical and causal, on the one hand, by which we discern creation to be His glorious work; — the disciplinary and moral, on the other, by which we own our free-will to be His responsible servant. There are few, I believe, who, having left your father after this more advanced training, did not stand upon the threshold of the life then opening before them, with some breathless feeling of its grandeur and awfulness."[1]

The following is Dr. Martineau's own account of the general knowledge he accumulated during those two fruitful years: —

"Several Latin and Greek authors were added to my scanty list; and the admiration excited by Tacitus, Juvenal, and the philosophical treatises of Cicero, and by Sophocles and the

[1] "Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL.D.," edited by his son, Russell Lant Carpenter, B.A., 1842, p. 342 *sqq.*

easier dialogues of Plato, had a permanent influence on my literary and moral feeling. Being at that time intended for the profession of a Civil Engineer, I was allowed to devote some extra time to mathematics and the elements of natural philosophy and chemistry; so that, before I left, I had been put in possession of Euclid, the Conic Sections, Plane Trigonometry, and the elementary formulas of Spherical, and of the fundamental conceptions and methods of Physics, Chemistry, Physiology, and Geology."[1]

An old exercise book survives, containing five themes, signed by James Martineau, "On Honour," "Advantages of a Taste for Science and Literature," "Was Brutus justifiable in assassinating Cæsar?" "On Fortitude," and "On Liberty," the dates ranging from Sept. 5, 1819, to Dec. 13, 1820. The schoolboy copperplate bears no resemblance to his later handwriting, and neither in the thought nor the composition is there any sign of precocity, or any clear promise of the future distinction of his style. The sentiments are of course unexceptionable, but hardly rise above the commonplace of an intelligent and conscientious boy.

His character and progress, however, gave entire satisfaction, and rejoiced the hearts of his parents, who were solicitous for his highest welfare. Soon after he arrived at Bristol he received from his mother what he describes as a "kind and wise motherly letter, to set her boy of 14 on the right track from the first." This letter also prepared him to expect a visit from his father, who required some change and recreation after a period of anxiety due to the depression of his business. The following August he had the pleasure of hearing from his mother in acknowledgment of a letter which she and his father "had repeatedly read with gratification, reporting a valuable present from Dr. C., given as a mark of approval and affection." This probably refers to a copy of Southey's "Roderick, the last of the Goths," on the fly-leaf of which are the following words: —

[1] Bi. Mem.

"These volumes are given to James Martineau as a testimonial of general and successful diligence in the objects of mental culture to which he has been directed during the preceding twelvemonth, and of satisfactory progress in several branches of useful knowledge; to encourage his exertions in acquiring the habit of persevering active application under difficulties and discouragements; and to express my approbation of his punctuality and correctness in the execution of several little trusts assigned to him, and of his general conduct as a pupil, and my affectionate desires for his welfare. — L. CARPENTER.

"BRISTOL, Mids^r, 1820."

During his school days young Martineau looked forward to entering the profession of an engineer, for which he had a distinct aptitude. Some connections of his, who were in that profession, not having room to receive him, recommended that he should be sent to a London millwright. Accordingly enquiries were set on foot, at the beginning of 1821, for an eligible firm. These inquiries for a time proved fruitless; and his mother, in writing him an account of them, in February, 1821, found occasion for "so much admirable advice and record of experience" that he kept the letter as "equally characteristic of her wisdom and high principle." A subsequent letter, April 22, 1821, informs him of an introduction to Mr. Fox, who had machine-works at Derby, and of arrangements for an eventual apprenticeship to him for three years. Accordingly, in the summer his school life came to an end; and, with a more manly career opening before him, he made virtuous efforts, on which his mother commented approvingly, to overcome his feelings of shyness and reserve towards his older brothers, who were entitled to his entire confidence. The brother nearest to him in age was seven years his senior.

In the summer, before entering on his new occupations, he paid a visit, along with his father and mother, at Newcastle upon Tyne, to his eldest sister, Mrs. T. M. Greenhow and her husband, on occasion of the christening of their

first child. From Newcastle they went into Cumberland, on the invitation of an old friend of his father's, whom the latter had not met for upwards of thirty years. The effect of this visit must be given in his own words: —

"The pleasant days under his roof I should have less distinctly remembered, had they not given me my first sight of a range of mountains. It was only a distant view, for the house was in the neighbourhood of Cockermouth; but, whenever I could, I stole out into the garden, to look once more and renew the longing wonder with which those sunny knolls and dark hollows filled me. The longing was in some degree satisfied by a nearer but too hasty glance at the Crummock and Buttermere hills on our way South; whence I carried away, however, little more than an intense sense of unvisited glories." [1]

On the return journey he parted from his parents at Derby, where he resided in the house of the Rev. Edward Higginson, the Unitarian minister in that town. A great and unexpected change, however, was at hand. The deeper intellectual and spiritual forces of his nature began to assert themselves, and to turn his desires into new channels. Several causes contributed to waken into self-consciousness the secret stirrings of his higher genius. Notwithstanding his decided taste for mechanical work his new occupation failed to satisfy him. His master, clever and energetic, had raised himself from a humbler class, and had not the intellectual equipment needful for giving systematical instruction in mechanics. He thought it enough to place his pupil at the lathe or the bench, and, allowing him the run of his shops, let him scramble as best he could into the rules of the business. This total want of intellectual help was disappointing to a lad who was anxious to learn the scientific principles of his work, and he looked with dismay at the prospect of devoting precious years to mastering the construction of a very limited class of machines. The higher activity of his mind being thus left unsatisfied, the religious impressions

[1] Bi. Mem.

made on him at Bristol seemed to deepen, and prepared him for the moment when a higher call came to him in tones not to be mistaken. His tendency in this direction was augmented by a repulsion which he felt from the society in which Mr. Higginson moved, contrasted as this was with the deeply religious spirit which he found in the home of Henry Turner, a young Unitarian minister at Nottingham, a cousin by marriage, whose house he frequently visited. This friend he describes as "one of the purest, truest, most devout of men";[1] and his early death "haunted" him, he says, "with a profound and sacred sorrow."[2] Indeed it was to the impression made upon him by this event that in his later life he attributed the change in his career. A valuable light is thrown upon his history and his ideals by the following passage from the report of a speech which he delivered in Nottingham in 1876, at the opening of the new High Pavement Church, and which is said to have deeply moved his audience by the tones of inspiration in which he spoke: "Here in Nottingham it was, that, under a sudden flash and stroke of sorrow . . . the scales fell from his eyes, and the realities and solemnities of life first came upon him. Here it was that the religious part of his life first commenced; in fact the light was so overpowering and so strong, that it bore him from the workshop of his occupation, and turned him from an engineer into an Evangelist. He well remembered, under the fervour of the first enthusiasm, how the voices that sounded in our various places of worship appeared to him to be beneath the exigencies of the case — too sober and too cold; and amid the broken light of an immature judgment he thought there ought to be some stronger and more spiritual ministry, that should less depend upon our self-help, but should take us off our feet, and fling us into

[1] In a letter to F. W. Newman, Nov. 27, 1882.
[2] Bi. Mem.

a diviner life than that which prevailed among us." It was in reference to such a moment that in his old age he asked, — "Who can ever forget the intense and lofty years when first the real communion of the Living God, — the same God that received the cries of Gethsemane and Calvary, — and the Sanctity of the inward Law, and the sublime contents of life on both sides of death, broke in a flood of glory upon his mind, and spread the world before him, stripped of his surface-illusions and with its diviner essence cleared?"[1]

One other influence must not be overlooked, as it is referred to by himself. In the house of Mr. Higginson he met a companion, who was to be the partner of a large portion of his life. "The incipient attachment which, seven years after, was crowned by marriage, favoured the mood of enthusiasm which impelled" him towards the Christian ministry.[2] The result of these various influences was that at the end of a year he expressed his wish to change his profession. His father warned him that he was courting poverty, but recognising, no doubt, the purity and depth of his resolution, consented to the change of plan, bore without reproach the forfeiture of the premium paid to Mr. Fox, and engaged to bear the expense of his theological education.

At that time the national universities were closed against Dissenters, and it was necessary for them to resort, for their higher education, to little colleges founded and maintained by themselves, in which the traditions of university culture, handed down from the time of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, were carefully maintained. Manchester New College was the principal institution to which Unitarians resorted for their training both in arts and in theology. Founded in Manchester in 1786, on the closing of the Warrington

[1] "Loss and Gain in Recent Theology," reprinted in the collected Essays, IV. p. 330.

[2] Bi. Mem.

Academy, it was removed to York in 1803, to be placed under the direction of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, who continued at its head till its return to Manchester in 1840. The College was situated in Monkgate, outside Monkgate Bar, one of the old city gates, on the left-hand side of the Scarborough Road as one leaves the town. The buildings, though not erected for the purposes of the College, formed three sides of a gravelled quadrangle. Fronting the street was the residence of the Tutor in Mathematics, and Natural and Experimental Philosophy, who at the time which our narrative has reached was the Rev. William Turner, M.A. On each side were small houses, converted into rooms for the students; and opposite the tutor's residence was a wall, with a gate, which was duly locked at fixed hours. A lecture-hall, with class-rooms, and dwelling-rooms over them, had been built nearly behind Mr. Turner's house. Here prayers were read daily at 8 A. M. and 9 P. M. by the students in succession, the lay students taking their turn with those preparing for the ministry. The students met for breakfast, dinner, and supper in the dining-room of Mr. Turner's house. They had tea in their private rooms, usually arranging to meet in parties of three or four. The dinner-table, which formed three sides of a square, was presided over not only by Mr. Turner, but also by his wife.[1] The theological and classical tutors lived not far off, and four of the young men resided in the house of the latter. The old St. Saviourgate Meeting-house served as a College Chapel, where the students were expected to attend twice on Sunday. In the afternoon, at least at a later time, a student preached; and if his sermon by its length hindered his fellow-students from reaching the Minster in time for the anthem "his

1 These and other particulars are drawn from recollections of Mr. Alfred Paget of Leicester, who for about a year and a half was a fellow-student of Dr. Martineau's. They have been kindly supplied by his daughter, Miss Clara J. Paget.

zeal was not blessed by his (College) hearers." A student of later date refers "to the awe and wonder of the great Cathedral, the entrancing strains of the mighty organ played by a consummate musician, and not least the golden glory of the declining sun falling through the west window as we departed."[1] It is interesting to observe that the use of alcoholic beverages was forbidden, and in their place the students drank strong coffee, "the preparation of which was a tradition of the College solemnly imparted to each neophyte by some benevolent senior."[1] As a provision for less busy hours there was a large grassy space at the back of the College, where the students used to walk, and talk, and practise games. There one day a young lay student made bold to address Martineau by his Christian name, and the new-comer's elder brother was very indignant with him for taking such a liberty, but Martineau laughed it off. For exercise, pole-leaping was much in vogue. Cricket, then less common than it has since become, was introduced in 1827, and the club included Martineau among its members.[2] Boating on the Ouse, however, was a favourite recreation, and Martineau had a fine boat, which was sent to him as a present from his father all the way from Norwich; and there is a record of his having sold it for nine guineas after he left College.[3] The tedium of study was further relieved by various societies, for cultivating the power of debate, gaining familiarity with Shakespeare, practising glees, and other purposes.

It is necessary to glance at the qualifications of the men under whose guidance the education of young Martineau was now placed, and especially at his own estimate of them; for though the veneration of a pupil may seem to indifferent

[1] Mr. W. H. Herford, who has kindly communicated some particulars from his memory of a later period.

[2] From Mr. Alfred Paget.

[3] In a letter of April 25, 1828.

spectators to throw a halo of pious imagination around his teachers, still for him the elevating influence was real, and love sees further into the soul than indifference. The Rev. Charles Wellbeloved was the Theological tutor, and was in the full maturity of his powers. He lived till 1858, when he died on the 29th of August, in the ninetieth year of his age. In an address delivered in the following October, at the opening of the Session of Manchester New College, Mr. Martineau paid him a noble tribute of reverential affection, from which one or two extracts must be given. He says: "Permit me . . . to fall back for a moment into the position of a student, to recall the priceless memories of that eager and thirsting time, and once more turn a grateful look to the benignant form now sinking into the shadows of the past. Well do I remember the respectful wonder with which we saw, as our course advanced, vein after vein of various learning modestly opened up; the pride with which we felt that we had a Lightfoot, a Jeremiah Jones, and an Eichhorn all in one, yet no mere theologian after all, but scarcely less a naturalist and an archæologist as well; the impatience with which, out of very homage to his wisdom, we almost resented his impartial love of truth in giving us the most careful epitome of other opinions with scarce the suggestion of his own." He was "a master of the true Lardner type, candid and catholic, simple and thorough, humanly fond indeed of the counsels of peace, but piously serving every bidding of sacred truth. Whatever might become of the particular conclusions which he favoured, he never justified a prejudice; he never misdirected our admiration; he never hurt an innocent feeling or overbore a serious judgment; and he set up within us a standard of Christian scholarship to which it must ever exalt us to aspire."[1] The extreme impartiality which sometimes cast a chill upon the ardour

[1] See the whole passage in Essays, IV. p. 53 *sqq*.

of youth appeared to Mr. Wellbeloved to be required by the principle of the College, which then, as now, imposed no theological tests, and, instead of indoctrinating its students, endeavoured to provide them with sound materials for the construction of their own edifice of belief. Dr. Martineau thus witnessed in its extreme form fidelity to that principle to which he himself was so loyal in his later years; but he put a somewhat different interpretation upon its requirements, and, while treating all reverent opinion with equal respect and never attempting to impose authoritatively his own convictions, he did not think it his duty to withhold from the student that clear expression of belief and that personal guidance amid conflicting systems which the bewildered inquirer finds so helpful and stimulating.

The Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., was the tutor in the Greek and Latin languages, History, and Literature. He had been educated for the Non-conformist ministry, had taken his degree in the University of Glasgow, where he gained high distinction, and had recently spent a year in Germany, where he studied under Wolf, Boeckh, and Zumpt, besides listening to Schleiermacher and other less distinguished men. In due time he rose to eminence, and successive works which issued from his pen placed him in the front rank of eminent scholars. Like Mr. Wellbeloved, he reached his ninetieth year, and when in 1877 Dr. Martineau contributed an obituary account of him to the Theological Review, the writer looked back through half a century to the classes from which he had carried "a standard of philological accuracy, of historical justice, of literary taste," which ever afterwards directed his aspirations. From this account a few descriptive words may be added: "Look at him in his lecture-chair, at the age of thirty, and cut off from view all below his face, and in the massive brow, the steady eyes, the full deliberate lips and measured frugality of words, you would take him for a veteran scholar who had taught so long as to

have outgrown the use of books." "The whole method of Mr. Kenrick in the conduct of his department was marked by a paramount devotion to the requirements of his students, and a disinterested suppression of all erudition superflous for them." In his "treatment of every subject, there seemed to be one constant characteristic, — a comprehensive grasp of its whole outline, with accurate scrutiny of its separate contents. Nothing fragmentary, nothing discursive, nothing speculative, broke the proportions or disturbed the steady march of his prearranged advance." "More than anyone we have ever met in life, he surrendered himself unconditionally to objective evidence; would accept anything, where this was cogent; nothing, where it failed." "He was above ambition, incapable of pretence, eager to see things as they are, and assured that, through the darkness that sometimes enfolds them, the only guide is the unswerving love of truth."[1]

The resident tutor, the Rev. William Turner, M.A., who has been already alluded to, was, though less distinguished, thoroughly qualified for the duties of his position.

In addition to the teaching of the regular staff we hear of lessons in elocution, given by an actor from Covent Garden or Drury Lane.

Among the influences of College life an important place must be assigned to the companionship of fellow-students. During the whole or a part of the time when Mr. Martineau was at York several men were at the College who, in subsequent years, were highly respected, and occupied positions more or less distinguished in the ministry, in law, in medicine, or in business. A few of these, who are more nearly connected with this biography, may be mentioned: Edward Tagart, who succeeded Mr. Madge at Norwich, and married the widow of Thomas Martineau, the eldest brother

[1] Essays, I. p. 397 *sqq.*

in the Norwich family; John Hugh Worthington, who was for a time engaged to Miss Harriet Martineau, and whose sad and brief story need not be here repeated; Franklin Howorth, a man of singular devoutness and purity of character; R. B. Aspland, who was Honorary Secretary of the College from 1846 to 1857, and thought it his duty to oppose the appointment of Mr. Martineau to the chair of Philosophy; Edward Higginson, brother of the future Mrs. Martineau; Francis Darbishire, to whom young Martineau was so strongly attached that their rather exclusive comradeship did not meet the full approval of the other students; William Gaskell, M.A., for so many years the honoured minister of Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, and subsequently connected with the College as Honorary Secretary, Professor of English History and Literature, Chairman of Committee, and Visitor; and, finally, Samuel Bache, who married Mrs. Martineau's sister, and for about thirty-six years was a well-known minister in Birmingham.

The following letters to Mr. Thomas Hornblower Gill, relating to two of these early friends, will be read with interest: —

THE POLCHAR, AVIEMORE, June 30, 1882.

MY DEAR MR. GILL, — Your account of the last offices at the grave of our beloved friend, Franklin Howorth, was deeply interesting to me. Indeed it so fills me with joy to think of the impression left by his simple and saintly goodness on thousands of hearts, that I am lifted above sorrow for a death which can so purify the spiritual atmosphere of a great industrial community. And this is the man who, for his too faithful and searching demands upon the conscience of his first hearers, had to be got rid of with their old chapel, in exchange for something more attractive that would sit easier upon life and relieve it from inward reproach! The treatment which he received left on me an impression — of grieving alienation from the prevailing spirit of my Unitarian fellow-believers — from which I have never recovered; and though my thought is still largely with them, my heart has gone over into other communions.

I am very glad that your love for our friend found voice at his grave. No one could so well and faithfully interpret the reverence and affection of those silent listeners, longing to pour forth the secret that filled their souls. . . .

Believe me ever,

Yours most cordially,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

In a speech delivered at a meeting of the Domestic Mission in Liverpool in 1857, Mr. Martineau referred to Mr. Howorth as one for whom he felt "a deep and reverential affection," and whom he recollected "at the same desk with himself, reading out of the same book, giving answers in the same class," and as "an early associate of his in many of their first trials of ministerial duty and Christian affection which formed the training for a Christian minister." [1]

THE POLCHAR, AVIEMORE, Aug. 28, 1882.

DEAR MR. GILL, — Francis Darbishire, I find, quitted York in 1826, arrested in his career by incipient consumption, which he inherited from his mother, and which carried him off in 1833. A singular revolution was wrought in his character at the crisis which withdrew him from College. In 1825, at the time of our religious meetings, he shared all the enthusiasm which brought us together; and in all relations, human as well as divine, was aglow with affections at once lofty and tender, and brimming over with the free expression of them. He and I especially were like two lovers, and had not a thought kept from one another. After he left College and turned to legal studies, he came to look upon our life together as an enervating romance, and severely condemned it as an unworthy surrender to sentiment. He gathered up his inward force into a Spartan rigour of self-suppression and reserve, adopted a prosaic estimate of men and things, content with small expectations from them; and objected to any utterance or recognition of feeling; though he retained in action and judgment the high faithfulness of conscience which had always distinguished him. Often have I feared that I was the unconscious cause of this, by putting too great a strain, through my own fervours, upon a nature capable indeed of being wrought up

[1] Taken from a cutting from a newspaper report.

to their temperature, but normally less intensely pitched. His was probably the wiser level, — or at least was a warrantable recoil from a foolish and untenable one. With his small allowance of years, he had to learn his mistake quickly; while we through our long probation could afford to be slow pupils of experience, and come to a sober mind by insensible fading of the colours once too bright. I well remember the Selby day described in Howorth's letter. It was recalled to me vividly not long ago by my alighting on the evening sermon amongst a host of others which I was committing to the flames. Those missionary excursions were full of deep interest for us, and were, as I believe, an admirable discipline for our future work. Our excellent tutors, especially Mr. Wellbeloved, looked upon them with dislike, from a very natural contempt for our qualifications as preachers, and from desire to reserve all our zeal for study alone. But the congregations seemed to find something quickening in these unstudied services, which made amends for their youthful crudeness of thought. And those who were most deeply engaged in them were certainly among the most assiduous and thorough students in their College work.

With regard to our dear friend Howorth, I have really nothing to add to the general record of my impressions already given. His character was simple; our life was simple; our tie was simple, — that of a common aim at Christian faithfulness; and with these elements the story is told. He was not intellectual; with other of my companions, there were discussions and competitions; but such interests he never carried beyond the class-room. He was irreproachable; and there were with him none of the alienations and remonstrances which now and then disturbed the harmony of our society, and even led to tragic scenes. So, though I have nothing to withhold or prohibit, neither can I contribute anything which will add a single touch to the portraiture so happily committed to your hands.

Believe me always,
Yours most sincerely,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

Dr. Martineau's own reminiscences of his College days may now be presented in words written at two widely separated periods of his life. The first paragraph is from a sermon preached at the fiftieth anniversary of the College,

on the 24th of January, 1836; the subsequent fuller account is from the Biographical Memoranda: —

"With respect to the College of which I have now the privilege to be the advocate, and had once the higher privilege to be a pupil, I can hardly venture to speak, lest in the warmth wherewith I might enumerate my obligations, I should seem to ascribe to it more than I possess. A retrospect of the peaceful period of youthful studies, over eight intervening years of toil not without its tears, is apt, indeed, to exhibit the past in colours too tender; its faint voices come to us as a melody athwart the troubled waters of life. However that may be, I must render, in a word, my tribute of gratitude. The hours spent in that much-loved retirement, I muse on with delight: the ideas with which they furnished me are among my choicest treasures; and those who imparted these ideas, or enabled me to find them, live and grow in my most affectionate veneration. Would that all could enter life through such a vestibule of well-directed years! and life would be to them a temple of duty, consecrated by cheerful memories, and kindling with inextinguishable hopes."

"The five years spent at York include — like every college period — considerable chapters of inward history; but only a few memorable outward changes. Without taking an equal interest in all the College classes, I made it a point of conscience to give impartial attention to the studies prescribed for each year; and was content to bear the inevitable consequence, that in this or that subject I was liable to be outstripped by specialists. Such small credit, however, as may attach to successful competition among twenty associates fell to my lot in some form at the end of every session open to honours. Though I had no longer any professional motive for prosecuting mathematical studies, Mr. W. Turner's admirable teaching gave them a fresh impulse of interest for me, and enabled me, before I left York, to attain the great object of my ambition,—the reading of Newton's 'Principia.' Grateful as I was to him, however, I owed him a grudge for one thing. He taught us to do our work by the fluxional instead of the differential notation; and it cost me some trouble afterwards, when I had under my care students of Trinity College, Dublin, to master a new method, and impart a dexterity which I had hardly acquired. The same remark applies to Mr. Wellbeloved's teaching of Hebrew, without the points. Excellent

Hebraists may doubtless be formed under these conditions. But scarcely had I left College when I had to prepare pupils for examination on the ordinary grammar and the pointed text; and the preliminary schooling of myself for this duty was a task of needless severity.

"Within a small inner circle of the students there prevailed a spirit of devout and semi-ascetic enthusiasm which bound them together in strong affection and subordinated their intellectual industry to higher inspirations. One effect of this was, a repugnance to prizes and honours, as an indignity offered to the intrinsic nobleness of knowledge, and a childish appeal to a lesser good when the mind is thirsting for the greater. This feeling, I remember, laid powerful hold of John Hugh Worthington and of myself, just when we had finished our competing labours for the most coveted College distinction, — a prize for the best translation into Greek of a prescribed excerpt from some English book. For six weeks we had been working at Ferguson's 'Roman Republic,' in the fond hope of making a chapter of it read like Xenophon. We had chosen our mottoes and sealed up our MSS., when lo! apart, in our separate rooms, during the lonely evening meditation, a secret shame at our poor rivalries fell upon us both; and in the morning was confessed, discussed, confirmed. We lost no time, but flung our packets at once into the fire. Our chief regret was that we thus condemned our remaining competitor to walk the course, and spoiled the zest of his honours.

"While this fervour of spirit animated chiefly the most assiduous students, it rendered the dry life of mere intellectual industry intolerable to them, and impelled them to escape, at least on Sundays, into a higher region of activity and affection. They allied themselves with a venerable man of remarkable force of intellect and character, who for half his life had toiled as an artisan and preached as an apostle, and now, in his old age, needed help in sustaining the village congregations which he had formed. A College missionary society supplied John Mason with a band of youthful coadjutors, and expended our pent-up zeal in labours which transported us from books to life. In the village of Welburn, almost at the gates of Castle Howard, the society to which we preached so increased that no room was large enough to hold it; and the students managed, during one of their vacations, to collect the means of building a small chapel. Fancying that my engineering experience would enable me to construct anything, they insisted on my acting as architect; and it devolved upon me to

draw the plans, and ride over periodically to superintend the work. On one of these visits I met Sydney Smith on the ground, looking at the rising walls. He was incumbent of the parish, and could not regard a new conventicle with favour. On my saying, in the endeavour to parry his good-natured grumbling, that without the chapel the people for whom it was meant would go nowhere, he replied, 'Well, well, it is a pity they won't all come to me; but so long as you only gather and tame my refractory parishioners, I shall look upon you as my curates, to get the people ready for me.'"

His College years were not passed without pleasures of a more domestic character. At this time he was the "idolised companion" of his sister Harriet. On Christmas Day, 1821, the year before he went to College, his mother wrote: "Your letters, I really think, are productive of more pleasure to her than any one circumstance besides; she does love you entirely, as you do her; and I feel an inward glory in witnessing such a pure and valuable friendship as that which subsists between you. Long, long may it be continued uninterrupted!" Once, having discovered how wretched she was when he left home after the College vacation, he advised her on each occasion to take refuge in some new pursuit, and, "on that particular occasion, in an attempt at authorship." The result was that she wrote an article for the "Monthly Repository," which attracted the admiration of her eldest brother, who was not in the secret, and thus became the beginning of her great literary career. Afterwards, when she proposed to write the "Political Economy" tales, "brother James," she relates, "nodded assent; my mother said, 'Do it'; and we went to tea, unconscious what a great thing we had done since dinner."[1] It was no doubt owing to such incidents that she wrote in a published letter, of June 3, 1833, to M. B. Maurice, in reference to her taste for literary pursuits, — "that which has contributed to it

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 117 *sq.*, 139.

more than all the rest is the affection subsisting between me and that one of my brothers whose age is nearest to my own, and who adopted one of the learned professions." Again, "From that moment, I was continually talking with my mother and the brother whom I have mentioned to you, of the plan which I am at present executing."[1]

This strong attachment between the brother and sister gave a peculiar delight to a pedestrian tour in Scotland, which the kindness of their father enabled them to enjoy in the summer of 1824. The young man had thrown himself, with all the ardour of his nature, into the studies of the College, and followed them with such exclusive devotion, that, before many months had passed, his mother remonstrated with him about his long silence, occasioned, as she heard and believed, by too anxious application; and, as time went on, his friends were afraid that he was injuring his health. However, he and his sister showed no lack of physical energy on their tour. They proceeded first to London, in order to take the steamer to Edinburgh, and embraced the opportunity of hearing Edward Irving, and visiting some who were less known to public fame, though highly esteemed in their own circle. He also called on Mrs. Barbauld; and in later years he communicated the following recollections of his visit to the Rev. Charles Beard: —

April 28, 1874.

I am not sure that I ever saw Mrs. Barbauld more than in that one call (in 1824, I think), when I came across Sir James Mackintosh and Samuel Rogers in her drawing-room at Newington Green. How I could gather courage to knock at her door, I cannot imagine; for, as a student at College, I was not, I believe, remarkable for effrontery; and I had a profound reverence for her which would have withheld me

[1] The reference is to the "Illustrations of Political Economy," which M. Maurice was translating into French. The letter, addressed to him, was prefixed to the French translation, and rendered back again from the French in the "Monthly Repository," 1833, p. 612 *sqq.*

from any uninvited approach. I had been breakfasting, I think, with Mr. Rutt, the Editor of Priestley; and either through him, or through an aunt of mine, Mrs. Lee, long a neighbour and friend of Mrs. B., I believe I had received a message of welcome which I thought it would be negligent to disregard. How far the picture which remains to me of the thin, frail form, the delicately chiselled features, the bright sharp eye, is pure personal memory, or is helped out by published portraiture and description, I cannot tell. With my impression of her kindly and gracious reception, and of her vivacious pleasure in surprising me with the names of her two visitors on their leaving the room, imagination has nothing to do. As she was evidently fatigued by the previous call, I did not stay long. A few of the minutes were spent in trying to translate for her amusement some sentences of the Greek newspaper which Lord Byron had sent, and Mr. Rogers had left, and during the remainder, some questions about my York studies led her to speak affectionately of the old Warrington Academy, and the pleasant society it was the means of gathering together.

It may have been on this or a previous occasion that he saw the ghastly sight of several bodies of executed criminals hanging over the walls of Newgate.[1] The steamer sailed on the 27th of July; and the month's excursion which followed extended as far North as the Bruar Falls, and West as Loch Awe. The following account is given in the Memoranda: —

"Taking the steamer from London to Edinburgh, and the coach to Perth, we there assumed our knapsack and handbasket; and never stopped till, at the average rate of fifteen miles and a quarter per day, we had walked five hundred and thirty miles. The lines of our route are now well-known tracks, beaten by the feet of Cook's irregular troops. And we had no more exciting adventure than that, in a fruitless rush to catch a mountain sunset, I got benighted on the Cobbler, and, only by desperate runs and slides, reached the road, soaked and bruised, just as my sister was hastening to the Arrochar

[1] Mrs. Scott, sister of Dr. Birkbeck Hill, told me that she had heard this from Dr. Martineau himself, the spectacle having been seen from the coach on his first visit to London. — J D.

Inn, to arrange a torch-light search for me. But it was a delightful month. To both of us it was a first free admission into the penetralia of natural beauty; and we walked everywhere with hushed feeling and reverent feet. We were perfectly at one, both in the defects which limited our vision and in the susceptibilities which quickened it, neither of us caring much for the savage romance of Scottish traditions, and both being intensely alive to the appeal of mountain forms and channeled glens, and the play of light and cloud with the forest, the corrie, and the lakeside. And in the fresh morning hours, before fatigue had made us laconic, the flow of eager talk — as is usual with young people — ran over all surfaces, — even plunged into all depths, — human and divine; with just the right proportion of individual difference to prevailing accordance for the maintenance of healthy sympathy. That journey lifted our early companionship to a higher stage, and established an affection which, though afterwards saddened, on one side at least never really changed. I was the younger by three years; but my systematic studies so far redressed the balance as to render reciprocal respect not impossible; while my sister's acute, rapid, and incisive advance to a conclusion upon every point pleasantly relieved my slower judgment and gave me courage to dismiss suspense."

A brother of Mr. Charles Wicksteed's had been drowned in Loch Catrine; and the following allusion to this event was written in a letter from Newcastle in the September following the tour: "The thought of him and of the awful and impressive circumstances of his death gave me a peculiar interest in the place; though it is a matter of perfect indifference what the scene and circumstances of the Christian's departure are, yet there is something very delightful in the thought of the last repose being passed in so sweet a grave, with no record of the dead but in the memory of the living, and no other requiem than the murmur of the water and the music of the breeze." In the same letter appreciative reference is made to "intercourse with the venerable Mr. Turner," of Newcastle.

But if the York period had its pleasures, it was not to pass without severe family trials. The eldest brother,

Thomas Martineau, had adopted the hereditary profession, and settled in Norwich, in partnership with his uncle, P. M. Martineau, the eminent surgeon. He seems to have been a man of peculiarly noble character, and refined intellectual tastes. Symptoms of consumption set in, and early in 1823 he went in search of health to Torquay, accompanied by his recently married wife and his sister Harriet. The visit proved unavailing, and it was decided that he should go with his wife to Madeira. Prior to his departure the family assembled one Sunday evening at his house, and the affecting religious service, with the beautiful prayer offered by "brother James," dwelt long in the memory of those who were present.[1] At Madeira he lost his infant child, and he himself died on the voyage home, in the summer of 1824. Dr. Martineau thus alludes to him: —

"In my boyhood his elevation of character and refinement of culture had lifted him, in spite of his sweetness of disposition, too far above me for his influence to descend upon me with power. But no sympathy was so ready as his to support my change of profession; and from that crisis, the elder brother's reserve seemed to pass away; his heart opened to me many a secret admiration and reverence as he read his favourite poets or discussed the graver problems of life; and as the beauty and balance of his mind revealed themselves to me, I reproached myself for my early blindness, and mused upon the new image with wondering affection. Our intercourse being only occasional, his death was not so much a removal as a transfiguration."[2]

This loss was followed by another, which, if less pathetic, had much larger consequences for the family. At the beginning of 1826 the father became seriously ill. In the spring he was sent to Cheltenham, only to return in a few weeks, "with the impression of approaching death on his face." His son James was summoned from York,

[1] Mrs. Higginson's Notes.
[2] Bi. Mem.

and in a letter of June 10 speaks of the agitation of the first interview, before they could converse with calmness and cheerfulness, so plain was it that the end was at hand. Delirium ensued from increasing weakness, with intervals of paroxysm, and the sleep of exhaustion. He needed help which only a man's strength could supply, and James slept close to his room. On the 21st of June he "died quietly, with all his family round his bed."[1] His business, which had been prosperous, declined so seriously during the financial crash of the previous season that he was obliged to alter his will, and leave his daughters what "could barely be called an independence." They were, however, prepared for this change; for these wise parents had no reserves from their children, and let them know that sooner or later they might have to work for their own living. Even this remnant of former comfort was soon to disappear; for in June, 1829, the old Norwich House was closed, under circumstances admitted to be highly honourable, and the mother and daughters, whose money had been placed in the business, lost at a stroke nearly all they had in the world.[2] Dr. Martineau describes these sad events in the following words: —

"Business anxieties had traced their lines upon his face; his vigour, which had always depended largely on hope, had sensibly declined; and the brightness of his life was dulled, and only fitfully reappeared. He was in the shadow before he was lost to sight. Transparently ingenuous, faithful, honourable, and gracious, he never had an enemy, except the spies and informers of the Liverpool administration; and if he left his affairs in an entangled condition, the blameless disaster fell little on his creditors, mainly on his family. My mother, whose strength of mind rose to every emergency, conformed herself, instantly and without repining, to the twofold change brought by sorrow and misfortune; and, throwing her quick

[1] H. M. Aut., I. p. 129.

[2] *Ib.*, I. p. 128, 141. It is believed that all the debts left unpaid at the time were ultimately discharged.

sympathies into my sisters' several projects for self-maintenance, found compensation for the partial break-up of the family circle in the new and separate interest attaching to each daughter's pursuits and experience. The troubles of governesses, and the first struggles of a literary career, presented problems strange to her; but her admirable judgment and vigilant affection rendered her counsels fertile in wise suggestion. . . .

"As I could not let my expenses at York be a tax upon my Norwich brother, I applied for a College bursary, and received it for the remainder of my time. My vacation, too, was economically spent, without indulgence of wandering propensities."

A trial of a different kind must receive a passing notice. He was debarred from intercourse with Mr. Higginson's family at Derby, with the exception of Edward, who was a fellow-student; and letters of the time speak of four years' "exile and silence." His devoted friend Francis Darbishire acted as a confidant, and during those "years of suspended intercourse with Helen was the sympathetic medium of communication." The attachment of one who was still a minor was looked upon as too precarious to justify an engagement; and the "exile" seems to have ended with his birthday in 1826 when he could claim to be a man. It will not violate the sacredness of their engagement to quote a few words from Miss Helen Higginson's birthday greeting, addressed to him on April 19, 1827.

"It seems to me almost inconceivable that a year ago we were so nearly as if we had never met; for so indeed we were, compared with what we now are to each other, in love, in confidence, in hope. A year ago, on the day when you will receive this, you were writing to me for the first time in four years, with a fervour and depth of feeling characteristic of the occasion, but with how little knowledge of my character, or acquaintance with my heart! And yet I believe that the time shall come when the present perfection of love and confidence shall be to our matured love and expanded affections as that imperfect past is to us now. So may it be through every stage

of this life, until, united endlessly and forever, we shall look down with delight on these steps to an eternity where imperfection and ignorance shall be no more known."

This notice of College life may be closed by some reminiscences furnished by a fellow-student, Mr. Alfred Paget. Martineau's room was in the building on the left, as one entered from the street. He was tall, thin, and intellectual looking, and, while he was distinguished by his love of study, his great abilities were recognised by all. He was reserved, and did not join freely with the other students even in recreation. This was partly due to his absorbing friendship with Darbishire, with whom he read and walked, and found all the companionship that he cared for. Hence he became "more genial and accessible" after Darbishire left. Mr. Paget, two of his cousins, and Martineau left College at the same time, June, 1827. They joined in a farewell party with their fellow-students at Bishopthorpe, a village three miles off, equally accessible by road or river. Some rowed and others walked out. They had tea at an inn, a favourite resort near the river, played at bowls on the green, and wound up with a bowl of punch, drinking of healths, and speech-making. On that occasion "Martineau expressed regret for having confined himself so exclusively to one friendship during part of his College course, and said that, if he had his time over again, he should wish to avoid that error, and be more generally companionable."

Chapter III

FIRST SETTLEMENT AND BEGINNING OF MINISTERIAL LIFE, 1827–1832

As his College course drew to a close it was necessary for young Martineau, whose brilliant qualities were already beginning to attract attention, to look round him for a settlement in life. He had some negotiations with Loughborough,[1] the Park Chapel in Liverpool, and Taunton; but early in 1827 he received, through Mr. Kenrick, a proposal from Mrs. Carpenter, of Bristol, which had everything in its favour, except that it laid out for him no ministerial duty. Dr. Carpenter, owing to failing health, was no longer equal to the labour of his busy life, and was at this time absent on the continent, seeking to recover tone of mind and body. Martineau was invited to take his place at the head of the school during his absence, and to share his labours, when resumed, on liberal terms of partnership. He sent an answer through Mr. Kenrick, accepting the offer, with distinct reservation of self-dedication to the ministerial life. To that ulterior object he thought this prior experience might well be a helpful introduction. In May Dr. Carpenter felt compelled to resign his pulpit, and new possibilities were thus opened before the mind of the youthful preacher. The congregation, however, were not in a hurry to make a fresh appointment, as they hoped that their former pastor would

[1] The letter declining an invitation is dated Sept. 18, 1826 (from a note furnished by the Rev. Clement E. Pike).

be able, after a sufficient period of rest, to take up once more his work among them; and these hopes were not disappointed, for in August, 1828, Dr. Carpenter, having resolved to close his school, acceded to the earnest request of the congregation that he would resume his duties, which he accordingly did in the following January. This uncertainty in the state of affairs at Bristol will help to explain Martineau's future action.

And now we must view him for a short period as a schoolmaster. On the first of August, 1827, he proceeded from Derby, where he had been on a visit, to Bristol, and at once flung himself with characteristic ardour into his new employment. His friends were somewhat alarmed by the amount and constancy of his work, and his future father-in-law remarked: "If Dr. Carpenter ever did anything like what James has represented himself as doing, I do not wonder that he has worn out body and mind together; and if James goes on so till Christmas you will see him exhausted too." [1] That this unstinted labour was not thrown away is proved by the deep impression which he made upon the minds of the boys entrusted to his care, and the affection with which, through life, they remembered those early days. The following words are from a letter written to Mr. Russell Martineau by the late Dr. William Radford of Sidmouth on Nov. 22, 1875.[2]

He speaks of "the wonderful zeal, ability, and tact he displayed when he undertook the very delicate and very onerous task of managing Dr. Carpenter's School during his long absence through illness. I believe all of Dr. Carpenter's pupils who are still alive would agree with me in saying they never knew or heard of any Schoolmaster so near their ideal of perfection; one who had such lofty aims and devoted himself with so much earnestness and so much judgment to carrying

[1] Reported in a contemporary letter.

[2] The year is not given in the letter, but I believe the above statement is correct. — J. D.

them out; one who exacted so much work, and maintained so strict a discipline, yet inspired such warm affection. When Dr. Carpenter returned, he wished your father to write a report of his stewardship. One passage only I can recollect; in it your father said he had 'followed in Dr. Carpenter's steps at a very humble and a very humbling distance,' and the passage struck me because I thought your father had much underrated his success, that he had in reality approached very near to the original. I cannot recollect a single interruption to the harmony and happiness of his reign over us, or one exception to the attachment and respect that was felt for him by his pupils."

That the old friend's recollections were true to the feeling of the time is shown by the following letter addressed to Mr. Martineau by his pupils on his retirement from the School: —

Dear Sir, — It is with mingled feelings of pleasure and regret that we now address you for the last time and beg your acceptance of these volumes, — of sincere pleasure when we look back on the happiness we have enjoyed in your society, and the advantage we have derived from your instruction, and your unprecedented kindness in our hours of recreation and amusement, — of heartfelt regret when we consider how short our connexion has been, and how soon it must terminate. Believe us that whether our present separation be permanent or not, we shall ever look back on this period with unimpaired satisfaction, and never cease to cherish the same feelings of gratitude and attachment. Whatever be the circumstances in which you may hereafter be placed, we can form no better wish than that you may still be the happy means of rendering to those around you services as numerous and important as those you have conferred on us, and that you may be equally successful in gaining their esteem and affection, and we shall consider ourselves fortunate indeed if we always possess a friend as watchful over our happiness and as attentive to our real welfare and improvement.

With our best and most cordial good wishes for yourself and all connected (or to be connected) with you, we remain, dear Sir, your most affectionate and grateful pupils.

Bristol, June 18, 1828.

The following was Mr. Martineau's reply: —

My dear Young Friends, — No degree of haste shall prevent my conveying to you a reply, however brief and inadequate, to the interesting and heart-touching letter which I have just received. I prefer the plan which you have adopted, of written communication, because I owe a reply to one at least, who is not here, and because I cannot trust myself to say to you what I would desire.

I accept your gift as an offering from that generosity and delicate kindness by which your conduct to me has always been distinguished; I accept it as the means of conveying to me good wishes which I sincerely prize; I accept it, that it may remain with me as a lasting memorial of a year of interesting and satisfactory duty, and may carry my thoughts and my wishes towards all those who have associated their names with this act of kindness. Though any efforts of mine to cultivate in you those pure and elevated and upright dispositions which ought to form the main object of Education have especially since Christmas been superseded by the influence of your other instructor, whom I have but followed at a humble and humbling distance,[1] I have no desire for any of you in future which does not yield in earnestness to the hope that you may never swerve from the course of simple duty, and never withdraw your steady gaze from the guiding star of Christian Principle. — Farewell, my dear boys. I cannot but ask myself the natural question, when and where shall we meet thus again; there are a thousand causes which may and must scatter us widely, but what can ever thus unite us except the hour and the place in which all must be collected? To think of that time, serious as the thought is, soothes the pain with which I leave you. Oh! may there be no wanderer there. Once more farewell; whatever lot await me I shall ever be your faithful and attached friend,

James Martineau.

Bristol, June 18, 1828.

Dr. Martineau's own impressions of that busy time are recorded in the following paragraph: —

"Accepting the offer, with the affectionate awe of an old scholar of the house, I entered at once upon the duties of a position to which, only six years before, I had looked up with

[1] This must be the clause referred to above in Dr. Radford's letter, erroneously attributed by him to a Report which he was not likely to have seen.

unbounded trust and reverence. The household management went on in its usual admirable way, under Mrs. Carpenter's direction, and left me free for the schoolroom and the study. But there were some pupils so advanced in culture and in age as to demand special care and time; so that the mere teaching, ranging over many subjects and every stage, was no slight strain upon my energies. And, besides this, I was the companion of the boys in their walks and play, their referee in the preparation of their [? lessons], and, above all, the trustee of parental authority, bound to study their dispositions and quicken and direct their conscience. Add to this that, being always on the spot, I was a convenient resource for the supply of Dr. Carpenter's pulpit whenever other substitutes failed; and it will not appear surprising that I look back upon that period as one of severe tension. None the less had it many a bright hour. Through the recommendation of Dr. Prichard (author of the 'Physical History of Man') I was admitted to a small, almost private, Philosophical Society of about twelve members, at which I heard the ablest local men — including John Foster, Herepath, Prichard, Conybeare — discuss the newest questions of the time and the greatest questions of all time. One friend at least, Mr. Samuel Worsley, still remains [1877] from that little circle; and though unaware how much his own thoughtful suggestions and accurate geological knowledge contributed to its search for truth, he doubtless registers its evening meetings, as I do, among the privileged passages of life. Another and more kindling influence I found in the preaching and the personal acquaintance (slight as it was) of Robert Hall, whose Thursday evening services in Bradmead I attended as often as possible. Going to him with the preconceptions imparted by his magnificent printed Discourses, I was at first cast down and distressed by his hesitating sentences and hacking voice; nor could I find in the thoughts thus uttered anything to compensate for their unhappy form. As he proceeded, however, the checking coughs became more sparse, the clipped speech more continuous, the tone richer, the meaning bolder; till at last, when, wrapped in the glow of his ascent, he has lost sight of the people and the place and feels no presence but of his inward vision and his enfolding God, he fairly becomes the organ of a higher Will, and paints or pleads or prophesies in an unbroken flow of lofty and pathetic meditation. *Persuasion* I never found in his preaching, but the contagious elevation of a powerful mind. He influenced men by not addressing them, yet thinking aloud before them. The more he

forgot them, the more did their critical mood die down, and their secret sympathy rise up and go with him, till they saw his vision and prayed his prayer."

At the age of ninety he still looked back lovingly to the Bristol days, and expressed himself as follows in a letter to Miss Estlin: —

MAY 11, 1895.

DEAR MISS ESTLIN, — No letter occasioned by my recent birthday touches upon tenderer memories than yours, and from my inmost heart I thank you for so vividly recalling to memory a figure most dear while visible, and sacred ever since.[1] Three years only, out of my ninety, were spent in Bristol, and in Gt. George St., — as pupil from 1819-1821, as responsible head from 1827-1828; but they contained a more fruitful experience in its bearing on the course of future years than any similar section of my life. They fell within the period of quickest susceptibility and most rapid growth; and all who ministered, either intentionally, or by the mere presence of a winning and impressive personality, to the expanding life still look down upon me with unfaded colours and expression from the picture gallery of my affection.

. . . . . .

The links, once so numerous, connecting me with Bristol, have become sadly few, or nearly worn away. Yet I do not complain of the loneliness of old age, which only calls on us to wait awhile and it will cease. Besides, it is the privilege of a life spent mainly in teaching to fall in love with a continuous series of young people, each entering on a life full of interesting possibilities and openings of noble hope, so there is no excuse for shutting oneself up in the past and trying to sleep through the stir of the ever moving present.

. . . . . .

Accept my warmest thanks, and believe me to the end,
Yours affectionately,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

As early as February, 1828, mention begins to be made of Dublin in his correspondence with Miss Higginson, who

[1] J. B. Estlin, Surgeon, who died June, 1855.

was fully consulted in regard to all his plans. She approved of his refusal to take any initiative in the matter, though, next to Lewin's Mead, Bristol, and Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, where there was a vacancy, she favoured the idea of settling in Dublin. About this time an incident which seems trifling in the retrospect illustrates not only his strong conscientiousness, but a dependence of judgment which was less known to those who were familiar in public with his clear decision and resolute action. He had received no invitation from the congregation in Manchester to be a candidate for the pulpit; but a proposal was made to him that, by a private arrangement, he should preach in Cross Street Chapel on the Sunday before the election. The authority of friends whom he deeply respected weakened his instinctive repugnance to this plan, and he consulted Miss Higginson on the subject. She was almost indignant that such a step should have been proposed, and argued the question with such clearness and force as to put to shame all hesitation. Then he wrote in strong compunction for having allowed his own aversion to the private arrangement to be so far overborne as to consult her before sending his refusal, and expressing deep gratitude to her for sustaining and clearing his best feeling on the matter. Her reply deprecates his "exaggerated self-reproach" and "unreasonable anguish," and declines to accept from him a "venerating love." To this correspondence Dr. Martineau appends the note: "The simple truth is that she had in a moment seen the right with far more decision and clearness than I." The name of Martineau having been mentioned by Dr. Carpenter to a friend in Dublin, he received in March an invitation to preach in Eustace Street Presbyterian Meeting House in that city. This Meeting House supported the services of two ministers. The congregation dated from the later part of the seventeenth century, its first two pastors having been the Provost and

one of the Senior Fellows of Trinity College, who were ejected under the Act of Uniformity of 1662. This persecuting Act brought a considerable accession of strength to the Presbyterian Church in Dublin, which was further augmented by an influx of French Protestant refugees. The several congregations were united in the "Associated Presbytery of Dublin," which was connected with the "Synod of Munster," and, taught by adversity, consistently maintained the principle of non-subscription to religious tests. The two congregations of Strand Street and Eustace Street had undergone a gradual theological change, and had, before the time of our narrative, embraced Unitarian views. The members of the latter especially were, nevertheless, highly conservative, and probably most of the members were attached to Arianism in its modern form. The Rev. Philip Taylor, a grandson of Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, had been a pastor in Dublin for more than fifty years, and was now retiring from active duty. The position, therefore, for which Mr. Martineau was invited to be a candidate, was that of assistant and eventually successor to this venerable man, a native of his own ancestral city. He determined to accept the invitation, and visited Dublin in April. He had received a friendly warning not to preach metaphysics, and had learned that his old College friend, Francis Darbishire, thought his delivery "almost tumid." Whether the metaphysics and tumidity were irrepressible does not appear; but the first election was not wholly satisfactory, the opinion of the chairman being adverse. To sympathetic souls, however, there was already deep spiritual power in his preaching. In the summer he preached in Norwich, and a lady, writing under the first impression of his sermon, said that it "made her tremble and shudder with delight, and cut up her heart into repentance." The objections which were felt in Dublin, whatever they were, were overcome, and before the end of the summer Mr. Mar-

tineau removed to Ireland. He travelled from Newcastle, and had a miserably wet and stormy journey to Port Patrick. The passage across the Channel was terrific. It blew a continued hurricane. "Each wave was like a great world of water"; and the sea broke entirely over the small vessel, drenching even the sails, so that there was not a dry thread on board. But the journey from Donaghadee to Belfast, and thence to Dublin, was truly delightful, the weather and country being beautiful. He was received with the greatest affection by his friends at Harold's Cross, and kindly by everyone.[1] Some of his English friends were alarmed about the condition of Ireland, which was then pressing its claims for Catholic emancipation. Mr. Martineau's convictions and sympathies were strongly in favour of that great act of justice; and a short acquaintance with Ireland enabled him to write these reassuring words: "This transmarine alarm is the cause of perpetual amusement here, where all is, and promises to be, as peaceable as in England." It was not only on his journey to Dublin that he was impressed by the beauty of the Emerald Isle. He was expecting his sister Rachel to join him in his lodgings; and one Tuesday evening in October he enjoyed a lovely stroll by the seashore towards Kingstown, where he expected to meet the boat early next morning. His impression must be given in his own words: —

"Imagine the clear full moon, with light now and then intercepted by a mass of fast-sailing cloud, shining over the distant mountains before me and on my right; a fine fresh breeze ploughing up the waters of the vast bay on my left, rolling them furiously to the beach, separated by a wall only from my path and scattering the foam and spray which rose and flew before it in a thousand rainbow hues; three or four distant lighthouses appearing to speck the ocean with their beacons, though in reality crowning the brow of some invisible land;

[1] From a contemporary letter. Mr. Taylor's house was at Harold's Cross, near Dublin.

not a sound but of the waves, or now and then of an approaching footstep; nothing, in short, to remind me of my vicinity to this resort of men except the city's lights reflected on a few overhanging clouds. It was a scene to be remembered." [1]

As he was looking forward to his marriage, and the salary was small, it was necessary for him to supplement his income, and the closing of Dr. Carpenter's School enabled him to do so in a satisfactory manner. Some of the older pupils were ready to follow him to Dublin; and especially he was assisted by Mrs. Radford, a widowed lady, who agreed to live with her two sons under his roof, and had sufficient confidence in him to offer the necessary advances, nearly £700, for purchasing the leasehold interest of an adequate house. After a short visit to friends at Harold's Cross and a residence of several weeks in lodgings with his sister Rachel in Summer Hill, his new home was at last fixed in Blessington Street, in the northern outskirts of the city, and a considerable distance from his Meeting House, which was situated near the southern bank of the Liffey, not far from Essex Bridge. He had some difficulty in finding a suitable house with a moderate rent, and it was not till the 11th of December that he joyfully completed his removal to the dwelling to which he hoped soon to conduct his bride.

His first service as a settled minister was held in Eustace Street, on the 28th of September. His ordination was postponed till the 26th of October; and the occasion was considered suitable for a full exposition and defence of Presbyterian principles, so that the service was not only impressive from its solemnity, but perhaps a little fatiguing from its length, for it occupied no less than four hours. Strand Street Meeting House was closed for that Sunday, so that its ministers might do their part as members of the

[1] From a contemporary letter to Miss Higginson.

Presbytery. A short sermon was delivered on "The Character, Duties, and Privileges of the Christian," by the Rev. Joseph Hutton (the grandfather of the late Richard Holt Hutton), who, on the retirement of Mr. Taylor, had become the senior minister at Eustace Street. This was followed by an elaborate "Discourse on Presbyterian Ordination" by the Rev. James Armstrong, Senior Minister at Strand Street. He maintained that in every matter connected with the ministration of religion the appeal must be to the Scriptures alone, the Bible being "an unerring rule of faith and conduct." On this ground he rested not only the maintenance of the Presbyterian order of Church government, but the unswerving adherence of their congregations to Christian freedom, the imposition of religious tests being opposed to the sufficiency of Scripture. He explained the meaning of ordination in the following terms: "By ordination nothing more is meant than the solemn appointment of an individual to some office in the Christian Church, which appointment is publicly witnessed by Ministers of the Gospel. By the laying on of hands nothing more is meant than a significant gesture to point out the individual who is thus set apart, and for whom a special petition is offered to Almighty God." At the close of the address he referred to the "free right of popular election," and called on the members of the congregation to testify their approval of the election by holding up their right hands. Then, addressing the young minister, he said: "Mr. Martineau, I now call upon you to declare, in the presence of the ministers here assembled, as witnesses of this solemn transaction, your views on undertaking the important office to which you are called as co-pastor to this congregation." Mr. Martineau replied in a short address, which must be quoted here, since it indicates the theological convictions which then had possession of his mind, and the view which he took of ministerial duty: —

"Every minister of the Gospel I conceive to be the servant of Revelation, appointed to expound its doctrines, to enforce its precepts, and to proclaim its sanctions.

"By the authority of this Revelation I believe myself supported when I assume, as primary principles in the conduct of my ministry, that the first and simplest religious truths are incomparably the most momentous — that there is no being with whom we have so much to do as God; and that as all religion begins, so also does it end, with exhibiting the relation which man bears to his Creator. To this infinite Being, and to Him alone, do I ascribe every conceivable perfection. He is the source of power, to whom all things are possible — He is boundless in wisdom, from whom no secrets can be hidden — He is love; the origin of all good, himself the greatest; and the dispenser of suffering only that we may be partakers of his holiness — He is spotless in holiness; his will the only source of morality, and the eternal enemy of sin, — He is self-existent and immutable, — for ever pervading and directing all things, and searching all hearts; the Being from whom we came, and with whom, in happiness or woe, all men must spend eternity.

"From these views I infer that it is my first office, as a Minister of Christ, to awaken the attention of my people to the claims of this one infinite Jehovah upon their adoration, obedience and love. As I believe him to be the only scriptural object of worship, so do I conceive the affections implied in that worship to be the greatest glory of the human soul, and to be absolutely essential to the acceptable discharge of duty here, and to participation in the felicities of heaven hereafter. I am conscious of nothing but sincerity in saying, that to inspire in others and in myself a devotion ever fervent and humble, which shall have a bearing on every duty, purify every thought, and tranquillise every grief, I desire to make the main object not only of my ministry, but of my life.

"At the same time I believe, that of the will, the purposes, perhaps even the existence of Jehovah, we should have remained in ignorance, had he not revealed himself, partially by patriarchs and prophets of old, and more gloriously by Jesus Christ, his well-beloved Son. Him I acknowledge as the Mediator between God and man, who was appointed to produce by his life, and yet more peculiarly by his death, an unprecedented change in the spiritual condition of mankind, and to open a new and living way of salvation. No pledge of Divine love to the human race impresses me so deeply as the voluntary death

of Jesus Christ, and his exaltation to that position which he now holds above all other created beings, where he lives for ever more, and from which he shall hereafter judge the world in righteousness. I receive and reverence him, not merely for that sinless excellence, which renders him a perfect pattern to our race, but as the commissioned delegate of heaven, on whom the Spirit was poured without measure — as the chosen representative of the Most High, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. As authorities for our duties, as fountains of consoling and elevating truth, Jesus and the Father are one; and, in all subjects of religious faith and obedience, not to honour him as we honour the Father, is to violate our allegiance to him as the great Captain of our salvation. When Jesus commands, I would listen as to a voice from heaven; when he instructs, I would treasure up his teachings as the words of everlasting truth; when he forewarns of evil, I would take heed and fly as from impending ruin; when he comforts, I would lay my heart to rest as on the proffered mercy of God; when he promises, I would trust to his assurances as to an oracle of destiny.

"Hence, I regard it as my duty to lead my hearers to this Saviour, as the way, the truth and the life; to urge on them his injunctions; to awaken in them a vital faith in his mission, an awe of his authority, a reliance on his predictions. More especially would I impress them with the conviction that this life is the infancy of existence; that its discipline is designed to conduct them to a state where all that is imperfect shall be done away; and that as they know not the day nor the hour when the Son of man shall appear, it becomes them, by vigilance and prayer, to hold themselves ready at every watch.

"These, then, I regard as the primary duties of the Christian minister; to awaken devotion to God, obedient faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and practical expectation of eternity. But I conceive that there are other and secondary duties, to the claims of which he must not be indifferent.

"The successive revelations of God's will to mankind I believe to be contained in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. These Scriptures were written in languages now extinct, and are the productions of a people widely separated from us, not only by time and distance, but by manners, character and condition. Hence there arises a necessity for human learning and research in order to understand and explain the contents of God's word. To secure the appropriation of some portion of

time to the acquisition of knowledge — to gather together the stores of history and philosophy, and apply them to the critical study of the Bible — I regard as an essential part of a minister's duty, and one great object for which a separate ministry is set apart. In like manner do I think it obligatory upon him not to hide the light that is in him, but to impart to his people, and more especially to the young, the knowledge which he may acquire, and the conclusions to which his investigations conduct him; that they may read the volume of holy writ with increased interest and intelligence, and that their minds may be opened to enlarged views of Christian truth. In these inquiries and instructions he requires, and can receive, no aid from the authority of any man or any church. His most valuable guides are his own mind and his own conscience; and his most valuable privilege in the use of these is his unquestionable right of private judgment. Whether he study, or whether he teach, let him stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made him free.

"Such is a brief summary of the objects which, as a Christian minister, I propose to accomplish. I pray that I may pursue them in the spirit of charity towards all men, and under a prevailing sense of accountability to the great Searcher of hearts. Full well do I know that I must review hereafter, in the unveiled presence of God, the ministry on which I have now entered, and that I must then meet those who surround me now, and whose spiritual interests I bind myself to serve. That no one may then appear to reproach me with unfaithfulness — that there may be no wanderer from the fold of Christ whom my neglect may have caused to stray, is the earnest and solemn desire which I now profess before God and my brethren."

At the close of this address "the Moderator, the Rev. Philip Taylor, having consulted the Ministers, declared their unanimous approbation of Mr. Martineau's sentiments, and their readiness to set him apart to the work of the Ministry amongst this Christian people, by prayer, and the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." He then offered the ordination prayer; and when he came to the words, "We devoutly pray that the choicest influences of thy Holy Spirit may descend on this thy servant," the Ministers laid on their hands. After the prayer the Moderator, the

other Ministers, and a lay representative of the Congregation, presented to Mr. Martineau the right hand of fellowship; and the service was brought to a close by a long and earnest "Charge" to the Rev. James Martineau and the congregation of Eustace Street, delivered by the Rev. Dr. William Hamilton Drummond, the Junior Minister of Strand Street Meeting House. A few words may be quoted, as they seem to strike one of the notes of Mr. Martineau's future life: "Allowing to others the same liberty of conscience which you claim as your own indefeasible birthright; anathematising none for a difference of creed, only desiring that each may be fully persuaded in his own mind, . . . you will show that you know how to blend an uncompromising adherence to those religious tenets which you believe to be true, with those expansively benevolent principles both of thought and action, which become the disciple of Christ." [1]

As soon as possible after entering his house in Blessington Street, Mr. Martineau started for Derby to claim the lady to whom he had been so faithfully attached for seven years. They were married on Thursday, Dec. 18, 1828, and he took his bride home to the administration of a large and various household, including six pupils, of whom half had entered Trinity College, and half were still under his sole care. The time which he could spare from his ministerial duties was thus fully occupied, and left him no large opportunity for pursuing his own studies. He was not yet familiar with German metaphysics or divinity; and with the Rationalists, who at that time were in the ascendant, he had little sympathy. His sermons were generally written under pressure, the last pages being finished while the car was waiting for him at the door, and sometimes even in the pulpit. He used to say that he wrote best under the stimulus

[1] The above account is taken from the "Ordination Service," printed in 1829.

of necessity. Even at that time they were "Martineauesque," distinguished by refinement in thought, taste, and language, and remarkable for combining bold generalisations with delicate analysis, and the most ardent, fearless love of truth with a warm reverential devotion. The manuscript was beautifully written, without an alteration or erasure from beginning to end.[1] He himself felt the production of sermons to be slow and anxious, because it was not at the command of mere will, but largely dependent on moods of mind that could not be unconditionally forced. His lofty style was beyond the reach of some of his audience, and there used to be a tradition in Dublin that a certain elderly gentleman declared that, when he went to hear Martineau, it was necessary to take a dictionary. Some of his figures of speech, too, were regarded at that time as a little highflown.

He began at this time the practice of holding catechetical and lecturing classes for the benefit of his congregation. It was customary at Eustace Street to have a sermon for young people on New Year's Day, and he embraced this opportunity for making proposals to hold a class for religious instruction. The classes actually began in March, a good number of children under fourteen meeting him in the vestry for an hour before service, and between forty and fifty people of more mature years waiting after service to hear a lecture on the state of the world at the Christian era. He was at the same time anxious to promote the general progress of Unitarianism, and favoured a principle of doctrinal union of which he afterwards strongly disapproved. The following paragraph from a letter written late in life indicates very clearly the position which he then occupied: —

[1] These particulars are taken from a letter of Dr. W. T. Radford's, December, 1875.

"On the particular subject of the right limits to the use of the word *Unitarian* I am in no position to reproach others who take your view; for in my early ministry I myself had no other thought, and under its influence suggested and organised in Dublin the Irish Unitarian Association, with congregational representation. The Unitarians of that day, in England at all events, were moulded by leaders, — Priestley from the Orthodox Dissenters, Lindsey from the Church of England, — who had simply adopted a new theology, without moving a hair's breadth from their old assumption, that Christian communion must be based on concurrence in theological doctrine. To one imbued, as I was, with this notion, the idea of a Unitarian Church, far from being repulsive, was in a high degree awakening to zeal; and I acted on it without misgiving, falling in with the then universal assumption that there could be only one way of right-thinking, — which was necessarily a way of like-thinking; so that people in quest of it might be sure they were astray if they allowed any latitude. This genuine dogmatic principle,—the principle of an *orthodoxy*,—everywhere prevailing, made church differ from church just according as *our* doxy differs from *your* doxy, and took for granted the presence, by an act of collective thinking, of one and the same doxy among all the members of a single church. Under such condition nothing could be more proper than to designate each church by a doctrinal name." [1]

He was also deeply interested in politics, and sometimes offended his more conservative hearers by his outspoken criticisms. He was especially anxious to secure the abolition of all civil disabilities on account of religious opinions, and accordingly attended the great meeting in favour of Catholic Emancipation held in the Rotunda on Jan. 22, 1829.

Early in December, 1829, he received congratulations on the birth of a first-born, a daughter. This child died in infancy, bringing the first sorrow into the happy home. Mindful of his Huguenot descent, Mr. Martineau had the body interred in one of the French cemeteries in Dublin. Before they quitted Ireland the husband and wife stood

[1] Quoted from a letter to the Rev. V. D. Davis, Dec. 22, 1891.

together in silence beside the little grave. Long years afterwards a venerable man of eighty-seven stole away from the bustle attending the Tercentenary of Dublin University, and stood once more beside the quiet grave, not now supported by the faithful wife, who long before had joined this first pledge of their love, but by a devoted daughter who watched over his declining days. Two other children were born to him in Dublin, Russell and Isabella, the former named in honour of the statesman who was so closely connected with the Reform Bill.

We may now turn to Dr. Martineau's own recollections of his Dublin life: —

"I had been already ordained by the Dublin Presbytery of the Synod of Munster, and in exercise of my pastoral functions for six months. These were less arduous than I could wish; the congregation being very small, and assembling only once each Sunday, and in every way disposed to give both themselves and their ministers an easy life of it. In all social relations we met with nothing but the most gracious and effusive kindness, which set us entirely at ease and especially won the heart of my wife, and still charmed her when she had learned to allow a little for national manners. Nor did my efforts to organise classes for systematic religious instruction of the young fail of a fair response. But the first approach towards questions of religious politics or doctrinal theology revealed to me the highly charged and sensitive atmosphere around. A sermon, mildly criticising the Arian doctrine, lost me the first, and, as I thought, the fastest friend I had in the congregation. He withdrew with his family to another place of worship, and wrote an agonised letter of adieu, such as a fallen Lucifer might have received from his most intimate angel. A signature which, with my venerated colleague, I had attached to a petition for Catholic Emancipation, brought down an explosion of wrath from a blustering but not very lucid gentleman, who 'had been credibly informed that ministers should not meddle with politics,' but who, nevertheless, thought it our duty to sign on the other side. Indeed, the anti-Catholic feeling evinced by the principal people in the society startled and shocked me beyond measure. In an endowed school connected with the Meeting

House, some forty orphans were lodged, educated, and qualified for apprenticeship; the vacancies being filled up by election in open vestry. The children, it was well known, were brought up as Protestants. At one of the elections a boy of very winning appearance, brought by a well-mannered father (the mother was dead), excited a prevailing interest in the members present; but it was suggested that no inquiry had been made respecting the parents' religion. The man was recalled and questioned. The mother had been a Protestant. 'And you?' said the chairman. 'I 'll not be desaiving your honour,' replied the father; 'the boy may follow his mother's road; but I 'm bound to be a Catholic.' 'Begone then this minute,' exclaimed the chairman, with a loud stamp of his foot upon the floor; 'how dare you show your face here? We have nothing to do with you and yours.' On my trying remonstrance, when the vestry resumed, he lifted his spectacles and looked at me transfixed, as a naturalist would look at a live Dodo; and though there were signs of some response to my protest, he had the meeting with him in treating it as an eccentricity and passing on to the 'qualified candidates.' Yet this chairman, apart from his Toryism and Protestantism, was a most estimable gentleman; of much benevolence and high honour; courteous and considerate, and in great social request for positions of trust and influence. This vestry incident, however, cracked the ice of a prejudice which, by repeated blows, was gradually and completely broken up; and, even before my return to England, a totally different temper already prevailed.

"The period of my residence in Dublin coincided with the flood of O'Connell's agitation, and [? under] the Lord Lieutenancies of the Marquis of Anglesea and the Duke of Northumberland party passion ran dangerously high. It was a curious experience to pass from the society of the very decorous, loyal, semi-Orange gentlemen of whom I have given a sample, to that of the old patriot and rebel, Hamilton Rowan and his heroic wife, at whose house the conversation, when it turned upon politics, recalled the brilliancy and audacity of the Paris Salons in '89. The old man himself, not otherwise particularly impressive, had the eyes of a tiger; and when he was in the mood to tell the story of his adventures, they seemed to kindle and perforate you like burning-glasses. His force was not intellectual, but of passion and will, and he was less at home when the presence of Lady Morgan and Lover, who were frequent guests at his table, directed the conversation

upon literature, society, and art. Neither the blind conservatism nor the ideal radicalism of the Irish parties attracted me, and I remained an outside observer of their struggle. It was impossible to follow O'Connell from audience to audience without acknowledging that, in versatility of persuasion and freedom of range, oratory can go no further, and without crediting each address, as it proceeds, with sincerity. But it was fatal to compare them, and the man, when apprehended as a whole, became a great artist, really sympathising with each part as he played it, but ready to exchange it for another, if needful for some unavowed end foreign to both." [1]

In 1830 Mr. Martineau preached, at the anniversary of the Synod of Munster, which met at Cork on the 7th of July, a sermon entitled "Peace in Division: the Duties of Christians in an Age of Controversy." [2] This excellent sermon does not bear out the charge of magniloquence of style. It is perfectly clear and simple, and not marked by great originality of thought. It points out that it is the duty of Christians to remember how many are their points of union, all denominations appealing to the affections in the universal language of the human heart. We must remember, too, the moral innocence of mental error, notwithstanding the fact "that faith is a compound result of the will and the understanding." And further, "it is the duty of every Christian in an age of controversy to make an open, undisguised statement of his opinions, and of the evidence which satisfies him of their truth." "The grand secret of human power . . . is singleness of purpose," and it is the want of this, and not of an ample sphere, or poverty of means, or mediocrity of talent, that makes most men so inefficient in the world.

During his residence in Dublin, Mr. Martineau compiled, for the use and by the desire of his congregation, "A Collection of Hymns for Christian Worship." The volume,

[1] Bi. Mem.

[2] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity," 1858, compiled by the Rev. W. R. Alger, of Boston, U. S.

which is anonymous, was framed on the basis of the old Eustace Street collection. The preface, which is dated Oct. 1, 1831, defends the practice of altering hymns which contain passages "objectionable on the ground either of theology or of taste," and assumes "the propriety of bringing all the resources of lyric poetry (the poetry of the affections) into the service of religion." Accordingly his Unitarianism did not lead to "any fastidious rejection of the form of address to our Lord"; for there seemed to be "no difficulty in distinguishing between religious homage and poetical invocation." Thus early he interested himself in improving the hymnody of the congregations with which he was connected; and it is perhaps worth noticing that of the two hundred and seventy-three hymns which this book contains more than two hundred (some of them with considerable alterations) are included in the later "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home."

The Rev. Philip Taylor died on the 27th of September, 1831, and this event led indirectly to Mr. Martineau's resignation. Before the disestablishment of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland, a portion of the stipend of Presbyterian ministers was derived from an annual grant of public money, known as Regium Donum. On the death of Mr. Taylor, Mr. Martineau became his successor, and thereby entitled to receive this grant. The questions involved in the relations between the Presbyterians and the State had not pressed themselves on his attention before he accepted ministerial duty in Ireland; but during his residence in Dublin the gross injustice involved in the relative position of the Catholic Church and the two chief Protestant bodies had become so oppressive to him that the very idea of being personally participant in it affected him with shame. Yet to refuse the Regium Donum would compromise the rights of his congregation, and this he did not feel entitled to do without their consent. Accordingly, after

serious thought, he determined to lay the case fully before his friends, and, if he failed to win them over to his own judgment, to tender his resignation. He addressed them in a letter, which was afterwards printed, and contains a statement of the reasons that governed his action. He begins by pointing out that the death of Mr. Taylor placed him in a new relation to the State, which seemed to him seriously objectionable, and which, after long and earnest deliberation, he found it impossible to hold. His reasons, briefly summarised, were the following: —

(1) The Royal Bounty was a religious monopoly, an exclusive appropriation of a fund which ought to have been general. "The nation at large contributes, Presbyterians alone receive." (2) It exposed the ministerial office to all the objections of a sinecure, because the ministers gave their labour to one party, — their congregations, while their remuneration came from another, — the State; and thus they received remuneration without duty performed to the remunerators. (3) All remuneration of a clergy by the State seemed to him to check the circulation, and impede the progress, of religious opinion. "That the average tendency of funds placed at the disposal, direct or indirect, of ecclesiastical bodies, is to produce subserviency to their leading faction, is a truth which may rest on an appeal to the whole history of establishments." (4) The credit and influence of Christianity were much diminished by its alliance with the State; for "as it is generally known that there exists a personal interest in religious profession, a widespread distrust in the sincerity of all belief is produced." These reasons satisfied him that the principle of the Royal Bounty was wrong; and if the *principle* was wrong, the *practice* could not be right. But he made no reflection on his brethren in the ministry who did not share his opinions; the only wrong was "in thinking in one way and acting in another." He felt that he had no right to

decide for his successors as well as for himself. "I therefore determined," he says, "to put the great question of establishments on its trial before you; to make you its tribunal, and ask you to pronounce on it a practical and emphatic decision. That there may be no doubt or ambiguity on a question so momentous, I state then in plain terms, that I cannot receive the Royal Bounty; that I ask only for your acquiescence in my unconditional refusal of it; and that, if you feel it necessary to withhold your consent, I will promptly relieve you of all embarrassment, by resigning a situation with the conditions of which I am no longer able to comply." He had carefully abstained from even the natural expression of his own feelings, because he wished not to influence their decision by appealing to anything but their own conscientious judgment, and he desired the person to be utterly sunk in the principle. He concluded with these words: "Suffer me to remind you how deeply your deliberation concerns the state and character of our little society, and the far more momentous and enduring interests of our blessed faith. I commend you solemnly to the guidance of your consciences and the blessing of the Great Father of Lights. Need I assure you that I am your affectionate and faithful friend and pastor, JAMES MARTINEAU."

He read this letter to his congregation on the 30th of October. No decision was reached, and finally the consideration of the subject was adjourned for a fortnight. The symptoms, however, were unfavourable, and the household in Blessington Street were filled with not unreasonable apprehensions. Whatever view may be taken of the convictions which guided his judgment, the event proved that he was ready to encounter grave risks, and make painful sacrifices, for conscience' sake. If he were forced to resign, he would have to break up his establishment of College students, to perfect which he had expended large sums upon

his house; and he would be compelled to sell the house in a fallen market, and ask indulgence of time from the friend who had enabled him to make the purchase. He would, moreover, be disqualified for settling elsewhere among the Irish Presbyterians, and through his residence on the west side of the Channel he was comparatively unknown in England. Mrs. Martineau thus expressed her feelings in a letter to her sister: "There is hardly an hour, not a day I am sure, but I look round this dear house and linger on this thing and that with a feeling of deeper tenderness from the tenure on which alone we can now hold them. But the principle keeps us up, and he shall never hear a word of regret from me over things that are consequent on an act of duty. What may be before us God only knows, and we are very thankful for the unanxious trust with which we are able to view the future." Friends in England felt a warm interest in the case, and Mr. Martineau received expressions of hearty sympathy and approval, especially from his mother and his brother Henry. He had the support also of his sister Harriet, who was then on a visit to Dublin. The younger members of the congregation were believed to be favourable to his views. People of discernment perceived that he was not a man to be lightly let go; so, though the most influential men were adverse to change, the issue of the discussion might still be considered doubtful.

On November 13 the decisive meeting was held. Mr. Martineau, it must be observed, had not tendered his resignation, but only expressed his willingness to do so if the congregation failed to support him on the question of the Regium Donum. His letter, however, was not so understood, and it was moved that Mr. Martineau's resignation be accepted. An amendment was proposed, that Mr. Martineau shall act in regard to the Royal Bounty according to the dictates of his conscience, and that the congregation do

not require his resignation. The resolution was carried by the chairman's casting vote, and was actually declared by him to mean that the young pastor's ministry had thereby come to an end, and he was to preach no more. On the following Sunday he sat, as an ordinary member of the congregation, in his pew. This action of such a bare majority seems unaccountably hasty and unkind, and he must have felt it keenly; but at a later time he writes: "This harsh termination of my first pastoral engagement I soon forgot in the compensating affection and generosity of the large minority, and of a numerous body that watched the struggle of principle with sympathetic interest from the outside." [1] Among others, Mr. Hutton's sons warmly took his side, and the Rev. Dr. Hutton wrote him a letter of heartfelt approval, and expressed his confidence that the act of protest and abnegation would bear good fruit. Mr. Hutton himself was deeply concerned, and responded suitably to his affectionate letter of adieu; yet, strangely enough, he defended the construction put upon the resolution of the congregation, and, mentioning that his own sons were moving for a Vestry meeting to beg for a continuation of Mr. Martineau's services till a successor was chosen, entreated him to stop them by refusal in advance. However, kinder and wiser counsels prevailed, and on the 12th of December he received an address unanimously passed by a congregational meeting on the previous day, expressive of respect and appreciation, acknowledging his past services, and asking him to continue them, as co-adjutor to Mr. Hutton till June, 1832. This invitation was accepted.

It was necessary to seek for a new appointment. Immediately after the adverse vote at Eustace Street he was sounded as to his willingness to establish an independent congregation; and an effort, supported by Dr. Drummond,

[1] Bi. Mem.

Mr. Classon, and others, was actually made, apparently without his knowledge or approval, to raise the necessary means. But he felt that the first elements of such a society would have to be drawn from the church which he was leaving, and he declined to impair the unity and practical efficiency of congregations which had the prestige of a venerable history. Mr. W. J. Fox, who had visited him in Dublin, and christened his eldest son, privately offered to commit to his hands, with a salary of £300, the organisation and conduct of the Domestic Mission in London, then projected though not begun. But, to use his own words, he "was conscious of no adequate store of resource and hopefulness for such a work." The prospect of a position better suited to his peculiar powers soon opened before him. Early in December Mr. F. Fletcher, of Liverpool, wrote to him, stating that a colleague was wanted for the Rev. John Grundy, minister of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters meeting in Paradise Street Chapel, and suggesting that he should put himself in the way of being heard. He declined to take the initiative, but expressed his willingness to preach. Before the end of the month, and again in January, he preached in Liverpool, where he was received with great kindness. A letter from Mr. T. Harvey, dated Feb. 7, 1832, conveyed to him the unanimous invitation of the Paradise Street congregation, together with a concurrent letter of the Rev. John Grundy, to become a colleague of the latter, as a pastor responsible for the duties of the church. Mr. Martineau acknowledged this letter in the following terms: —

My respected Fellow-Christians, — I acknowledge with sincere gratitude the expression of regard conveyed to me in your recent communication.

With a solemn desire to obtain by Christian fidelity to you the approval of a higher and more searching Tribunal, I accept the co-pastoral office which you have requested me to fill. Should our connection prove to be "profitable to you"

and honourable to the Gospel, to me it will be the source of pure and lasting satisfaction.

Believe me to be yours sincerely and faithfully,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On the receipt of this answer, the congregation at once expressed their satisfaction by raising the joint salaries to £400, to be equally divided between the colleagues.

In the summer of 1832 Mr. and Mrs. Martineau vacated their first home, paid a round of farewell visits to the friends who had brightened it by their affection, and crossed the sea, with a son and daughter, to enter upon their second and longest term of unbroken service. After their arrival in Liverpool Mr. R. Hutton was commissioned to convey to them a roll of parchment containing an address from the congregation at Eustace Street, and a present of 180 guineas. Their own warm hearts retained a kindly recollection of their Irish home, and were cheered by the fact that its associations were not wholly severed. "One precious link there was," says Dr. Martineau in his Memoranda, "which prevented the breach with Dublin life from being absolute. The dear friend, with her two sons, who had passed with us from Bristol to Dublin, now took a house near us in Liverpool; her younger son entering a solicitor's office for his legal training; and the elder prosecuting those scientific and literary studies which have made him one of the most accomplished of living men. In spite of great losses by removal, I managed before long to discharge my debt to her, and with it the last lingering anxiety of the Dublin crisis."

Chapter IV

PARADISE STREET, 1832–1848

On their arrival in Liverpool Mr. and Mrs. Martineau settled in a house of moderate size in Mount Street (No. 3). With reduced income, and the burden of a debt pressing upon him, he was unwilling to incur the risk of taking a large house dependent for its maintenance on resident pupils. It was necessary, however, to supplement his inadequate stipend, and this he succeeded in doing by courses of tuition which were acceptable to his friends and congenial to his own tastes.

"I proposed," he says, "to give private lessons to young persons past the school age and needing guidance in their ulterior self-culture. The proposal seemed to meet a real want; the numbers in my classes were adequate and steady, and while they relieved me from anxiety, I found in them a delightful source of intellectual sympathy with a succession of thoughtful young persons, and a salutary incentive for myself to preserve my mental stores from rusting and enlarge them by fresh accessions. And the relation between teacher and taught, in matters apart from theology, far from clashing with pastoral duty, so harmonises with it as to be its best support. Occasionally I was tempted still further from the field of professional action. The Liverpool Mechanics' Institution being in need of voluntary help, I undertook, with more courage than prudence, to deliver a course of Public Lectures on Experimental Chemistry, and soon after another, on Physical Astronomy. They led to the formation of classes for mutual instruction, some of whose members attained distinction as men of science and inventors. Other claims upon my time, however, soon compelled me to withdraw from this kind of work. In consequence of some papers written for Mr. Fox's

'Monthly Repository,' I was asked, on the establishment of the 'London Review,'[1] to enroll myself on its literary staff; and thus was commenced a habit of Review writing, which, when kept in due subordination, I have found conducive to vigilance and exactitude in study, and which best disposed of all spare time."[2]

The Chapel in Paradise Street was in the plain style adopted by the older Nonconformity, and, like the Chapel at Norwich, was in the form of an octagon. Here Mr. Martineau exercised his ministry for sixteen years, and laboured for the good of his congregation with all the zeal of his ardent nature. His powers were soon recognised both by those who were ready to welcome new ideas and those who resented his inroads upon ancient thought; and, like other powerful and original men, he not only attracted enthusiastic friendship but also excited keen animosity. The Rev. Charles Wicksteed thus describes the impression which he made upon his hearers: "Well does the writer remember (1877), though it is forty-five years ago, how the circular staircase of the somewhat conspicuous pulpit was quietly ascended by a tall young man, thin, but of vigorous and muscular frame, with dark hair, pale but not delicate complexion, a countenance full in repose of thought, and in animation of intelligence and enthusiasm, features belonging to no regular type or order of beauty, and yet leaving the impression of a very high kind of beauty, and a voice so sweet, and clear, and strong, without being in the least degree loud, that it conveyed all the inspiration of music without any of its art or intention. When this young man, with the background of his honour and courage, rose to speak of the inspiration that was not in the letter but in the soul, and (for that time of day) boldly distinguished between the inspiration of Old Testament books and Old

[1] Founded in 1835.
[2] Bi. Mem.

Testament heroes, he completed the conquest of his hearers." [1]

In order to exhibit him in another aspect, the following description may be quoted, though it belongs to a time some years later. The occasion is a school excursion to Hoylake, at the mouth of the Dee. "We had a steamer lent to us, and although it was rather a strong wind Mr. and Mrs. Martineau with five of their children and a good many of the other children, managed to keep up country dances, and Sir Roger de Coverly till we arrived at our destination. . . . We found Mr. Martineau, with many other gentlemen, playing at football, and it was delightful to see with what energy he kicked the ball, as if all the concentrated energy of his body were brought out in every blow. It was quite a sight to see him, with his coat and hat off, and his hair flying wild, dashing about in all directions, as lightly and nimbly as if he had been a boy. I am sure you would have admired him then, almost as much as in his calmer moments, for you would have known then, that whatever he does is in earnest." [2]

The impression which he left upon the mind of the young son of his colleague is also worth recording: "The Rev. James Martineau was not handsome, but what a splendid fellow he was! Benevolently ugly, if ugly at all, with his rough-cut features, wild upstanding black hair, low broad forehead, and swarthy complexion. I loved that man; I studied with him for a year or two, and whatever of good is in me I date to that time, and for it honour him. He taught me to think; I followed his flowing periods, flowery eloquence, and close reasoning with an appreciation, veneration, and attention I never have felt for man since; for he fascinated my expanding intellect, because he had not only

[1] "National Portrait Gallery," Part 78, p. 139 *sq.*, published by Cassell, Petter & Galpin.

[2] From a letter of July 10, 1844.

a great brain, but a great *heart*. I have lived a useless lifetime since then, but at least I have never forgotten that prince among men." [1]

How anyone could regard him as even *benevolently* ugly it is hard to understand. We must not indeed judge of his appearance altogether from an early portrait, which, while unmistakably like, and conveying an impression of his genius, has certainly received some conventional touches which make the face remarkably handsome; but the nobility and power of his expression attracted the gaze, and made faces technically more beautiful look commonplace by comparison. His height was five feet ten inches; his figure was erect and spare, allowing him to retain his buoyant activity till he was far advanced in years; the massive head was habitually bent a little forward, as though in the act of meditation; the lower part of the face was rather long and narrow; over the grey eyes the brows were more than usually prominent, and frequently contracted in thought, and over all was a cloud of dark and rather wavy hair, of which a thick mass sometimes fell carelessly over his forehead. His voice was singularly melodious, and full of expression; and when it was exerted in the delivery of a speech, especially on some spiritual subject, his countenance became radiant, as though a beam of light had fallen upon it. In his bearing he had that gracious courtesy which we associate with an older generation; and on solemn occasions there was an impressive dignity in his movements, which, being wholly unaffected, betokened his deep and sensitive reverence. Though rather shy and reserved, he expressed his opinions with promptness and decision, holding them with an ardour of conviction which sometimes ap-

[1] "Pictures of the Past: Memories of Men I have met and Places I have seen," by Francis H. Grundy, C.E., 1879, p. 45 *sq*. The recollections refer to the time which we have now reached. My attention was called to this passage by the Rev. J. E. Odgers. — J. D.

peared not to accord with the cautious judgment and pure love of truth under the influence of which they were formed. There is a tradition that once at College he was eagerly defending the necessarian hypothesis, when one of his fellow-students remarked, "Well, Martineau, I quite agree with you; but I would not be so positive about it." But positive as he was he soared to higher regions, and while the horizon of truth widened to his view he still trusted the expanding vision, resting assured that what he saw was real, though a realm of mystery stretched far beyond his reach. It was during this period that the greatest change in his philosophical and religious thought took place. This was partly due to the writings of Dr. Channing, by which he was deeply influenced, partly to his own growing spiritual experience, which seemed to escape the limits of the old interpretation. But the history of his philosophical changes must be reserved for another chapter; his general theological position will be indicated as we proceed.

During the next few years he worked as only a strong man could without serious injury to his health. The following is a report of his various occupations in the early part of 1833: "(*a*) 7 A. M. Young men's private class twice a week; (*b*) engagements with seven other classes three days of the week from 11 A. M. to 4.30 P. M., except three-quarters of an hour for dinner at 1.30; (*c*) two Sunday classes; (*d*) writing Priestley Papers; (*e*) preparation for chemical lectures at Mechanics' Institution; evening visiting two or three times in the week; Friday evening being always reserved for Sunday preparation." His Sunday labours were not always confined to his own Chapel; for we hear of his giving lectures at Renshaw Street on Church Establishments and National Education, in addition to his morning theological lecture in his own vestry. A list of his Sunday engagements when at their fullest will make manifest his zeal for the religious welfare

of his people: Lecture at 10 A. M.; service at 11; after this a class for about thirty-five young catechumens; then a hasty dinner at home at 2.30; a senior class of girls at the Chapel at 4 P. M., followed by one of boys, together numbering above thirty; tea in the committee-room, and lastly evening service at 6.30. But the opportunities afforded by Sunday did not appear to him sufficient. Early in 1836 he opened a Tuesday evening meeting at the Paradise Street Lecture Room with members of his congregation who chose to come, for the consideration of any moral or religious topics more fitted for colloquial than pulpit treatment. That this arrangement was eagerly welcomed we may infer from the statement that the first meeting was crowded. In addition to this meeting he had an open house for young people of the congregation on one Thursday evening in the month. We have already heard of his lectures on chemistry and astronomy at the Mechanics' Institution; but as though these, with his private classes, were not sufficient, he accepted at the end of 1839 the Presidency of the Philosophical Society, and delivered to that learned body a lecture on the Anemometer and other meteorological instruments. With his scientific tastes it must have been a pleasure rather than a burden to him to take part in the public preparations for the meeting of the British Association, which was held in Liverpool in September, 1837, and to keep his hospitable house open for the entertainment of the members.[1]

His secular labours, however congenial, were undertaken for the sake of increasing his income; for his expenditure considerably exceeded the amount of his stipend. But the revenue derived from private classes was necessarily precarious; and he considered seriously an offer, which was made to him early in 1837, of the head-mastership of the

[1] From contemporary letters of Mrs. Martineau's.

new High School at the Mechanics' Institution. Independently of the greater security of income, he was increasingly disposed to undertake the organisation of a school in which room would be given to carry out to the utmost all his own ideas. The minimum work, however, of seven hours a day appeared, even to his extraordinary energy, to be incompatible with the requirements of his ministry, and the offer was eventually declined.[1]

Under the pressure of such absorbing engagements it is not surprising that we occasionally hear of his being ill from over-work. Such failures of energy, however, were quite temporary, and the stress of labour was now and then relieved by pleasant recreations. In the summer of 1833 he had a six weeks' tour in France and Switzerland, and back by the Rhine, with his kind friends the Misses Yates of Farmfield. On another occasion (1845) he made a pedestrian tour in the Isle of Man with his son Russell, and long remembered "some boating on the exquisite green waters of the rocky coves on the coast line near Port Erin."[2] He seems generally to have had a month's or six weeks' vacation which he spent with his family in different country places. At one time it was at Llanberis, where he climbed Snowdon and boated on the lake; at another time at Grange; and again, for three successive summers (1841-1843) at Rivington, where the family occupied Mr. Darbishire's cottage, kindly lent for the occasion. A smaller cottage in the adjoining wood served for a study, and thither Mr. Martineau repaired at 9 A. M. for his reading and writing. He took walks with the elder children before their early dinner, and had lessons with them in the afternoon. After tea he returned to the study till it was too dark to see, and then, after locking up his books, he and his wife spent the hours of

[1] From contemporary letters of Mrs. Martineau's.
[2] Letter to Rev. V. D. Davis, June 16, 1889.

candle-light in writing letters, reading aloud, and chatting together. Nor was the work in Liverpool without its pleasant relaxations. We hear of his going, in plain dress, to a fancy ball; attending operas and the performances at the musical festival, and celebrating his birthday by romping with the children in the fields, while his wife sat on the grass to see the fun.[1] He retained through life his fondness for children, and liked to romp with them. One of his future pupils, when a small boy, was once captured by him, and, after a good swing, perched upon his head. On another occasion two little grand-children of his friend, the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, were expecting to go to the pantomime. One of them suddenly begged Mr. Martineau to go with them; and the result was that he took a large box at Drury Lane Theatre, and made up a party. Another anecdote illustrates his tactfulness and good-nature with children. During the war between Russia and Turkey Mr. Martineau was on the side of the Turks. One day when he and another gentleman were visiting the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, who took the other side, one of the children came in, armed with helmet and sword. Mr. Martineau at once greeted him, and said, "What, are you going to kill the Turks?" The child, who had an uneasy feeling that he might have been called upon by an unsympathetic stranger to kill the Russians, brightened up with responsive pleasure, and said, "Yes," to Mr. Martineau's great amusement and delight.

Before leaving this general description of Mr. Martineau's life we may subjoin some notes, from a manuscript by one of his children, giving an account of his relationship with his young family. The education of his children was largely conducted by himself, from the time when they were able to learn the first rudiments of geography and grammar.

[1] From contemporary letters.

"The elder ones, to whom naturally he devoted more of his time than was possible at a later period, remember these early instructions with especial pleasure and gratitude, for they were characterised by the truest sympathy, and a remarkable power of placing himself in the position of the young learner and adapting his illustrations to the capacity of each child. One of our earliest recollections of that happy time is connected with his teaching of physical geography, which he made for us a truly delightful lesson. . . . He taught English grammar, also, upon a plan of his own, which he must have thought out with much care and pains. . . . When this was well accomplished, he began with Greek, as the first foreign language, and this he taught also upon a plan of his own. . . . Often, whilst he was dressing in a morning, he used to call us in to repeat a noun or a verb, learned the day before, and this we used quite to enjoy. So plain and simple were the lessons made, that I remember when I some years later asked him why he had begun with Greek in preference to Latin, in teaching us, and he replied, 'Because I thought it best to take the most difficult language first,' I was surprised to find that it was considered to be so. He was particularly methodical in the arrangement of his time, and this it doubtless was which enabled him, together with great power of concentrating his attention, to accomplish through life so great an amount of work of various kinds. Our childish remembrance of him is that he was always busy, except at the short and happy intervals in the twilight or after tea, when he would play with us, or tell from his own remembrance, or read aloud, some interesting story. Yet it was very characteristic of him that he never seemed in a hurry, and if any of us, or any friend, wished to consult him, he always found time to hear, and to speak with full sympathy on any subject that was brought before him. We used to be struck with his calm gentleness and serenity at all times, and the influence it exercised over us was such that a word, or sometimes a look, from him was enough to make us eagerly anxious to follow out his wishes and to deserve his approval. I remember observing particularly, that whenever most pressed upon, either by the hurry of work, or by preparations for a journey, or by any unusual trial or sorrow, he was even more calm, collected and gentle in his whole manner than usual, and I often reflect how great must have been the self-control exercised hourly over a remarkably sensitive nature, before this could have been the impression

of his character upon young children. . . . Every Sunday we used each of us to learn a hymn by heart, out of the books which he had given us, with our names written into them by himself, and which we have kept always by us through life."

In the foregoing sketch nothing has been said of the deep inner life of faith which directed and controlled this wonderful activity. The nature of this must be learned from his published works. It is not known that he kept any private journal. The constant scrutiny of his own spiritual state would have been quite alien to his healthy and simple nature. His vision was fixed, not on the morbid anatomy of self, but on the Ruler of his conscience and his heart, in whom he found the attraction of all noble ideals, drawing him up into the free air of self-forgetfulness. No man could less have endured that the light of publicity should be turned on his private confidences with God; but this we may venture to say, that few men have come nearer to the fulfilment of the apostolic precept, "Pray without ceasing."

We must now revert to a more chronological arrangement. In 1833 the earliest of his collected essays, on "The Life and Works of Dr. Priestley," appeared in the "Monthly Repository."[1] In this essay it is already apparent that he was becoming dissatisfied with the older form of Unitarianism, which was bound up with the doctrine of necessity and the association-philosophy. His aversion to the popular forms of religion is indeed strongly marked. "Calvinism, like the magicians of Egypt, could poison and taint the salubrious stream; true religion, like the prophet's rod, could alone convert the current of blood into the waters of fertility." Again, "A ritual system can no more create a soul, than the study of Greek metres can make a poet."

[1] Reprinted in "Miscellanies," Boston and New York, 1852, and in "Essays, Reviews, and Addresses," 1890, Vol. I.

Still he rejoices to believe that Unitarians are beginning to perceive the error of a retaliative logic, and are thinking more of the interior spirit of devotion. And of Priestley, while giving a fine appreciation of his character and attainments, he says: "We do not assert that he was not precipitate; we do not say that he cast away no gems of truth in clearing from the sanctuary the dust of ages; we do not deny that, in his passion for simplification, he did sometimes run too rapidly through a mystery, and propound inconsiderate explanations of things deeper than his philosophy." One allusion shows that he had already turned his attention to German thought. In speaking of Priestley's lectures on literary subjects, while marking his superiority to his predecessors, he pronounces him "inferior to the noble school of German critics, whose genius has, in our own day, penetrated the mysteries, and analysed the spirit, of poetry and the arts."

In the course of the summer "a fine young man, named Emerson," presented himself, with an introduction from Henry Ware; but we do not hear what passed between the two men who were destined to rise to such high distinction.

Early in 1834 Mr. Martineau "preached to an immense congregation" on the attempts of the orthodox Dissenters to deprive Unitarians of their endowments; but he declined the publication of the lectures. In April, Dr. Joseph Tuckerman, the founder of what was known in the United States as the "Ministry at large," paid a visit to Liverpool, where he stayed at Greenbank, the residence of Mr. William Rathbone, and where he succeeded, as in other large towns, in rousing the attention of Unitarians to the claims which the poorest class of society had on their sympathy and zeal. The appeals of Dr. Tuckerman resulted in the establishment of several Domestic Missions; and, as we shall see presently, his visit to Liverpool was

not without fruit. "His thrilling tones, and his overflowing heart, and his consecrated life," and his "countenance, the light whereof was a divine charity," were long remembered by those who met him.[1]

On Wednesday, the 21st of May, Mr. Martineau delivered the anniversary sermon for the British and Foreign Unitarian Association at "The Unitarian Chapel in South Place, Finsbury." As this fine sermon, anticipating as it does some of the leading thoughts which have since been appropriated by theology, and sentiments which the religious world of England has not yet attained, is not now easily accessible, an analysis of its contents is subjoined. His subject was "The Existing State of Theology as an Intellectual Pursuit, and Religion as a Moral Influence." Taking for his text the account of the gift of tongues in Acts, he pointed out that "the ages are no less diversified than the countries of the world; and each, having a peculiar character, must be addressed in a peculiar language," and we are not to have "an inconsiderate passion for imitating the apostles." Animated by a wish to avoid this error, he proposed to enquire, "What are the means which we should now trust for the promotion of theological truth and the elevation of religious sentiment among the great body of the people?" As ideas were "propagated downwards through the several gradations of minds," the first requisite was the cultivation of "theological science" by "men at once erudite and free, men who have the materials of knowledge with which to determine the great problems of morals and religion, and a genius to think, and imagine, and feel, without let or hindrance of hope or fear." This leads him to defend "the application of the word science to theology" against those who are justly repelled by the "leaden and soulless productions of the

[1] From the Rev. Charles Wicksteed's sermon at Hope Street, Oct. 21, 1849.

theological press," the compositions of men who endeavour "to atone by microscopic accuracy for imbecility in fundamental principles, and not pervaded by that true spirit of history, that sympathy with the soul of antiquity, which is essential to the interpreter of the venerable monuments of the past." This low condition of theology is partly due to the fact that the right of private judgment has been mistaken for the power, and grave and intricate questions have been submitted to incompetent arbitration; and "that sectarian democracy, which abandons exclusively to the suffrages of the multitude the decision of theological perplexities on which erudition and philosophy pause, needs an emphatic discouragement." The remedy for this, as for other social evils, is to be found in the "reduction of authority to its minimum, and the elevation of intelligence to its maximum." "Another cause of the poverty of theological science is found in the fatal association between mental error and moral turpitude," especially when "viewed in connection with another mistake — the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures." Hence the alienation of thinking men from Christianity. But if this "be only the disgust of refined philosophy towards the spirit of vulgar dogmatism, . . . then it is no time either for contentment or for despair." The fittest men to vindicate the gospel are "those who are not acted upon by the influences which have degraded it; those who see in it nothing to repress, but everything to stimulate, the intellect, the imagination, the affections." "When men of this kind are encouraged by public sentiment to devote themselves to a free search into the resources of religious science; when high powers of intellect, attracted by the mysteries of nature, life and miracle, can speculate on them without compromise of mental liberty, or loss of moral sympathy, there will be better hopes for Christianity." While, however, it is the business of theology to discover the great principles of faith and

morals, it is that of religion to apply them; and this is the concern, not of the student, but of the preacher, and of all institutions which aim at the general diffusion of religious influences. But the attempts made in this country to bring controversy before popular tribunals, while they have made theology superficial, have rendered religion sectarian. The evils of sectarianism, with "its cold and hard ministrations" and "malignant exclusiveness," are exposed at length, and it is laid down that "the fundamental principle of one who would administer religion to the minds of his fellow-men should be, that all that has ever been extensively venerated must possess ingredients that are venerable." The religious reformer must have "a deep and reverential sympathy with human feelings, a quick perception of the great and beautiful, a promptitude to cast himself into the minds of others, and gaze through their eyes at the objects which they love. . . . The precise logician may sit eternally in the centre of his own circle of correct ideas, and preach demonstrably the folly of the world's superstitions; yet he will never affect the thoughts of any but marble-minded beings like himself." The practical application of creeds would create "a new criterion of judgment between differing systems; for that system must possess most truth, which creates the most intelligence and virtue." In conclusion he assumes that the object of the Association is to distribute works which must redeem theology from contempt, and to establish "union and sympathy among those whose first principles are in direct contradiction to all that is sectarian, and who desire only to emancipate the understanding from all that enfeebles, and the heart from all that narrows it. The triumph of its doctrines would be, not the ascendancy of one sect but the harmony of all"; and he looks forward to the time when "our work will be done, our reward before us, and our little community of reformers lost in the wide fraternity of enlightened and benevolent men."

Later in the year his congregation presented Mr. Martineau for the third time with a gift, amounting this time to £150, as an expression of their appreciation and personal attachment. He was now looking forward to being sole minister; for his colleague had become incapacitated through failing health. As Mr. Grundy was not an old man it was perhaps natural that he should be unwilling to resign; but Mrs. Grundy had frankly expressed the concern of herself and the family at his clinging to his office so long after being disabled for its duties. However, the resignation was at last sent in; and at a meeting of the congregation on Jan. 26, 1835, a resolution was unanimously and cordially passed devolving the sole ministry on Mr. Martineau, Mr. Grundy's retirement taking effect on the 25th of March. On the 28th of January this resolution was briefly but suitably acknowledged by Mr. Martineau. His letter ends thus: "I content myself now with assuring you that I do not receive my additional duties from your hands without a deep sense of the responsibility which they impose; that I shall speedily make arrangements for devoting to them a larger portion of my time; that I shall be thankful for such aid as the experience of my respected colleague will enable him, and his kindness will still dispose him to give; and that for success in the noble field before me I shall mainly trust to your co-operation, and to that Blessing which Providence is not slow to shed, where mind, hands, and heart are enlisted in the service of Truth and Love."

On the 27th of September he delivered a remarkable sermon, entitled "Views of the World from Halley's Comet." [1] This comet, which has a period of seventy-five years, had recently appeared; and the sermon pictures the various stages of civilisation which the comet might be sup-

[1] Essays, IV. p. 341 *sqq.*

posed to have witnessed on its successive returns since the middle ages. The preacher had no fear of the "breaking up of creeds and forms," which marked the present visitation: "It is the needful fusing of old material, ere thought is poured into new moulds and comes out in diviner forms." He cast a favourable eye on Political Economy, and had not discovered that it was a "dismal science." He says: "Led in another direction by one of the profoundest of philosophers, Adam Smith, society has turned to the study of itself. And that science, of which he was the creator, has already done too much in softening the jealousies of nations, in rebuking the selfishness of class, in exciting sympathy for the well-being of the industrious many, not to give good hope, from its co-operation with higher causes, for the peace of communities, and the civilisation of the world." Altogether the outlook is optimistic. Recent changes "have favourably affected the condition of the great body of the population; . . . and though that benevolence must be paltry, which can look with satisfied complacency at the present state of the public mind and character, — at the present amount of education and especially of religion, yet there is ground for gratulation, that the instruments of improvement are in our hands, and the aspirations of society still turned towards better things." The sermon closes with an eloquent argument on behalf of the individual immortality of man, "the infinite fidelity of God," and the changeless laws of Duty.

On the 14th of August a child, Herbert, was born, whose pathetic history will be given further on. In November, as Mr. Martineau objected to baptism, the infant was "dedicated" by the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, in presence of a large family gathering. "Mr. White lived at no great distance. He was pleased with the idea of a simple service of Dedication at the parents' house; and, though withdrawn from all public duty, readily consented, in expression

of private friendship, to join in our thanksgiving and leave with us his benediction." [1] "The memory of his sensitive features, grave expression, and deliberate speech" was inseparably associated in Dr. Martineau's mind with this occasion.[2]

On the 24th of January, 1836, Mr. Martineau had the honour of preaching, in Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, a sermon, in addition to one by Mr. John Kenrick, in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the little College he loved so well, and on which he was destined to confer such distinction. He chose for his subject the "Need of Culture for the Christian Ministry." [3] In addressing his hearers he set forth his own ideal: "You do not want less cultivation, but more soul; a more living spirit breathed into the outward forms of religion, and kindling them into the fires of a holier worship: you demand not a more empty mind, but one more teeming with aspiring thoughts; — a burning utterance, the overflowing of vivid convictions and quenchless desires; — appeals such as burst from men of high purposes and great hearts, heaving secretly with faith in God and hope for man." Even at that early period he recognised very distinctly the need of an historical treatment of the Scriptures, and perceived that to pass, through ample learning, "behind the veil of antiquity is the only method of rising to a genuine appreciation of the mind of Christ, or of attaining a clear vision of the perfect religion which it enshrines." It is interesting to observe his view of the evangelical narratives: "The Gospels, with one exception, were constructed from earlier documents, whose origin it is impossible to trace, and whose fidelity rests upon their

[1] Bi. Mem.

[2] "A Spiritual Faith. Sermons by John Hamilton Thom. With a Memorial Preface by James Martineau," 1895, p. xvii.

[3] Essays, IV. p. 357 *sqq*. So the title stands in the collected edition; but originally it was "The Demand of the Present Age for an Enlightened Christian Ministry." In the Essays, 1835 is a mistake.

internal character." It thus appears that, in accordance with the general state of the controversy at that time, he still accepted the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

Mr. Martineau was deeply interested in founding a Domestic Mission in Liverpool, on the general lines laid down by Dr. Tuckerman. The initiative was taken by his friend, the Rev. John Hamilton Thom; and this may be the proper place to say a few words about a man for whom, during the remainder of their joint lives, he entertained the profoundest regard. Mr. Thom was born in Ireland, and educated at Newry and Belfast, where he imbibed the Arian views which were prevalent at that time among the Unitarians of Ulster. He had settled in Liverpool three years before Mr. Martineau, having been for two years minister of the Ancient Chapel in Toxteth Park, and then having removed to Renshaw Street Chapel, the scene of the remainder of his ministry. His theology underwent gradual modification; but it was not the theological aspect of religion that most attracted him, nor was it in the field of intellectual speculation that his influence was felt. He had rare spiritual gifts, with a keen sense of all that was pure and ideal in character and aspiration, and his determining aim was to conform himself and his hearers to the "Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus." On those who came with prepared hearts, and were capable of entering into the deeper experiences of the Christian life, his preaching made a profound impression. His extemporary addresses at a city meeting, or a College commemoration, or the anniversary of a Mission, were long remembered by those who heard them. "Of speeches on this modest level," says Dr. Martineau, "often involving conflicts of opinion, historical narrative, and personal sketches, it has never been my lot to hear any comparable to Mr. Thom's."[1] Such was the man who, on

[1] "A Spiritual Faith." Memorial Preface, p. xxviii., where the characteristics of his speaking are fully described.

Christmas Day, 1835, preached a most impressive sermon, pleading for the establishment of a Domestic Mission; and Mr. Martineau resolved to ask him to repeat it in Paradise Street, in order to identify him completely and individually with the movement in Liverpool, and to unite the two congregations and their ministers in this philanthropic work. The ground being thus prepared, a meeting was held in Renshaw Street Chapel on Good Friday, the 1st of April, 1836, to constitute the Mission. The Chair was occupied by Mr. William Rathbone. The meeting was attended, and the resolutions supported, by men well known in Liverpool society; — the Rev. J. H. Thom, H. Giles, J. Martineau, J. Blanco White, Dr. Sheppard, Mr. Thomas Bolton, Mr. H. Booth, Mr. Christopher Rawdon, Mr. R. V. Yates, Mr. Thomas Holt, Mr. S. S. Gair, and several others; and Mr. Martineau had thus the satisfaction of helping to establish an institution which has grown in strength and usefulness down to the present day. The aim of the Mission was entirely unsectarian. It was to be "a distinct Ministry for the Poor, which would carry the spirit of Christianity to the homes of the neglected." The duties of the Minister were to be "to establish an intercourse with a limited number of families of the neglected poor — to put himself into close sympathy with their wants — to become to them a Christian adviser and friend — to promote the order and comfort of their homes, and the elevation of their social tastes — to bring them into a permanent connection with religious influences — and, above all, to promote an effective education of their children, and to shelter them from corrupting agencies." [1] The purely domestic character of this ministry necessarily passed away. Families became attached to the minister, and it was found advisable to start Sunday Schools and assemblies for worship, so that the

[1] Quoted from the resolutions passed at the meeting.

Domestic Mission now comprises a variety of agencies for ameliorating the condition of the poor, the original religious aim, to imbue them with the spirit of Christianity, never being lost sight of. Dr. Martineau retained to the last his sympathy with this beneficent work, and gave to it such co-operation as his pressing engagements allowed.

In 1836 appeared Mr. Martineau's first systematic treatise, entitled "The Rationale of Religious Enquiry; or the Question stated of Reason, the Bible, and the Church: in Six Lectures." The lectures had been delivered towards the close of the previous year, and the author felt at the time that "the popular form required for public delivery precluded any very systematic or philosophical treatment of the subject"; and in subsequent years he came to regard the work as a very immature statement of his views. Nevertheless these lectures not only contain passages of great brilliancy, but trace out with remarkable clearness and force a line of thought which the writer never abandoned, and which reappear with vast enrichment and elaboration in his latest systematic work, "The Seat of Authority in Religion." Indeed the very title of the later work is almost anticipated in the earlier: "Let us take to pieces the theories of the Roman Catholic and Protestant religions; . . . especially seeking to discover the supposed *seat of certainty* in each." [1] "It was with a view to improve his ideas of the *method* of investigating the characteristics of Christianity, and to estimate the value of the materials for judgment which present themselves," that the lectures were composed.[2] The first lecture, on "Inspiration," examines the authority of the books of the New Testament. The word inspiration is used in the technical sense which was current at the time, and is defined as "the Divine correction of intellectual and moral error"; and the conclusion is

[1] P. 73. The italics are in the original.

[2] Preface.

accordingly reached that we must pronounce the books "uninspired but truthful; sincere, able, vigorous, but fallible; all in them that depends upon veracity to be received, all else open to examination; their statements of fact to be admitted, their interpretations of them to be criticised; their reasonings to be respected, but sifted; their morality to be reverenced, but studied in its adaptation to their own age and position." [1] The second lecture, on "Catholic Infallibility," after a glowing picture of what the Catholic Church has accomplished in the world, proceeds to demolish its dogmatic claims. A Catholic would not feel much force in the argument founded on the foolishness of patristic traditions, for a system of dogmas might be handed down unimpaired, and yet leave ample room for the vagaries of legendary fancy. Much more convincing is the proof that a supposed authority, which itself rests on the probabilities of rational evidence, has no just claim to withdraw its allegations from the scrutiny of reason. The lecture on "Protestant Infallibility" deals not with the nature of the Scriptures, which has been considered in the first lecture, but with the practical assumption of each interpreter that he is himself infallible. The Bible is not trusted to go by itself among the people. "Preachers will go before it, and tell them what they are to find in it; creeds will go after it, and ask them if they have found it. . . . With all their boasting, not a book exists of which Protestants are so much afraid as the Bible." Hence Protestantism, equally with Catholicism, is pervaded by the spirit of persecution. In opposition to these imperfect views of Christianity, the fourth lecture defends the thesis that the Gospel is "a system of perfect rationalism." By rationalism is here meant the "principle which vindicates the prerogative of reason to apply itself to the interior, as well as to the exterior, of

[1] P. 32 *sq.*

revelation," and the German anti-supernaturalism is no necessary part of it. Against this feature of rationalism Mr. Martineau strongly protests. The business of the understanding in dealing with the Scriptures is twofold: first, to reach the original ideas of the authors; secondly, to yield to these ideas the right treatment, and consider how far their intrinsic evidence renders them credible. In the fulfilment of the former process our duty is "the same as in the case of any other book," to furnish ourselves with all the needful collateral knowledge, and then give ourselves freely up to the impression which the writings convey, "without any attempt to modify it by any notions, whether derived from an ecclesiastical creed or an individual theory, previously in the mind." In regard to the second function the following conclusions are reached: "That it is impossible to attain to any conviction more than rational; that there can exist no obligation, moral or logical, to set aside the suggestions of the understanding in obedience to external authority; that no seeming inspiration can establish anything contrary to reason; that the last appeal, in all researches into religious truth, must be to the judgments of the human mind; that against these judgments Scripture cannot have any authority, for upon its authority they themselves decide." The writer looks with hope to "emancipated Germany." "There, if anywhere, will be exhibited that truly sublime state of mind, faith, — absolute faith, — in truth: and the great problem will be solved, how to combine the freest intellect with the loftiest devotion; — and while inquiring always, to love and worship still." The fifth lecture speaks of the "Relation of Natural Religion to Christianity." The definitions here given would certainly not have satisfied Mr. Martineau's later thought. "*Revealed religion* comprises the ideas of God derived from the miraculous events recorded in the Bible." "*Natural religion* comprises the ideas of God derived from every other

quarter." The nature of religion is not elaborately analysed or defined; but such one-sided definitions as that of Schleiermacher are implicitly set aside by the recognition of religion as a "*form of truth*," a "*form of emotion*," and a "*principle of duty*," and therefore "the last and noblest exercise of reason, and love, and conscience." The relation between the two sources of religion is thus defined: revelation "is not a contradiction to the great principles of natural religion; this would destroy its evidence. Neither is it a mere record of them; this would render it useless. The true light in which to regard it is, that it is an *assumption* of some, and an *anticipation* or *confirmation* of others." The last lecture, on the "Influence of Christianity on Morality and Civilisation," disappoints, not by its want of eloquence and originality, but by the contraction of so large a subject into so narrow a space. In determining what particular features of our morality and civilisation are to be ascribed to the Gospel, we must apply the tests of *permanence* and *universality*. Two characteristics are selected for treatment, — the sentiment of the *natural equality of men*, and the *importance of speculative truth to the great mass of mankind*. The lectures, which are pervaded by an ardent love of Christianity, conclude with a fervid apostrophe to the "faith of our fathers." That the little volume, which in spite of its limitations and abandoned points of view might still be helpful to many anxious minds, met a real want at the time, appears from the fact that a second edition was required within a few months of its publication. Later in life Dr. Martineau spoke of it as "a juvenile production which I have long ceased to reproduce." [1]

A visit to London in July, 1837, enabled him to join the deputation of English Presbyterian Ministers, who, on the 21st of that month, proceeded to St. James's Palace to

[1] In a letter to Mr. Ireland, Nov. 6, 1886.

present an address to the Queen on her accession to the throne. The address was read by the Rev. Robert Aspland; and all the members of the deputation had the honour of kissing her Majesty's hand. The following year he was present at the coronation in Westminster Abbey.

On the 19th and 22d of June, 1838, an aggregate meeting of Unitarians was held at Essex Street Chapel, London, on the invitation of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, "to take into consideration the present state of the denomination, and to consult upon measures for promoting its future welfare." The principal object in view was the adoption of some means "of bringing the whole body of Unitarians in the United Kingdom into closer and more effective union." The congregations now known as Unitarian looked with aversion upon every form of Church government, which they believed must inevitably encroach upon their independence, and destroy the religious freedom which was their most precious inheritance. In order to meet this feeling, the following resolution was proposed and carried, with only two dissentient voices: "That this Meeting recognises and acknowledges the complete and thorough Independence of our separate Religious Societies, as to all matters of Internal Arrangement and Discipline; and whilst recommending Union, contemplates no measures which can interfere with this great and essential Principle." The next resolution was carried unanimously: "That it appears to this Meeting expedient to adopt some effective plan of Mutual Co-operation and Union amongst the Unitarians of this country." On this resolution Mr. Martineau raised a warning voice. He said that in its general form it presented nothing which was undesirable, and that there was no one who would make greater exertions to bring it about than himself. But the organisation which was proposed was essentially ecclesiastical, and would require some proposition as to the mode in which they were to unite; and

if the union were to be a sectarian or theological union of Unitarian churches, he for one would have to dissent from it. Another long resolution was brought forward, approving of the general plan and constitution of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and requesting its Committee to prepare and circulate an abstract of the plans suggested at the Meeting for the promotion of a closer and more effective union amongst the Unitarians of Great Britain and Ireland. This called forth an important speech from Mr. Martineau. He approved of the Association, and would esteem it an honourable task to defend it from unjust attacks. But its constitution was entirely sectarian, contemplating the diffusion of one fixed form of theological opinion; and therefore it could not be regarded as realising the ideas and desires of union which had led to the convening of the Meeting. He objected to the very principle of a sectarian or theological union among Unitarian churches. None such could be successful, because real and serious differences of sentiment had grown up among them. Theologically they were united simply as *dis*believers of the Trinity, and therefore their lapses from the mark of orthodoxy had no uniform direction, and reached to every gradation of distance, within the limits of Christianity. Moreover it could not be expected that their present forms of opinion would continue uniform and permanent. They were obviously in a state of transition, having a consciousness of religious defect, which excited earnest but vague aspirations after improvement. Again, the doctrines in which they all agreed were not regarded with the same interest by all the churches; and many of them conceived that little practical importance was to be attached to their view of the Trinity. They were descended from forefathers of Calvinistic belief, and they should be the last to deny the tendency of the system from which they were now estranged, to produce great and most excellent minds. To

admit this was to damp all the fuel of sectarian zeal. Their want of progress was due, not to defective ecclesiastical arrangements, but to the state of mind in which their system had its origin and support. Unitarianism had a sceptical origin, beginning with dissuasives from belief, and characterised in the eyes of others by its success in proving how few things need be regarded as wonderful and divine. The doubters and unbelievers of other and less reasonable churches constituted the new forces of their own; and thus a critical, cold and untrusting temper became silently diffused, unfavourable to high enterprise and deep affections. Moreover, when at length this spirit vanished, and the genuine sentiments of personal religion acquired power, the effect upon their consolidation, as a sect, was the reverse of that which was noticeable in orthodox churches. With those who esteemed error to be no less fatal than sin, the growth of piety inflamed sectarian zeal; with them, who attached no terrors to the involuntary mistakes of the sincere, it was otherwise. Become more devout in mind, they felt themselves not *more,* but *less,* discriminated from the true Christian of every faith; and their sectarian zeal underwent inevitable decline. Thus, as a mere theological denomination, they profited by the scepticism of other sects, and lost by the piety of their own. Accordingly, he had no sanguine expectations from any principle of sectarian union or schemes of mechanical organisation. If these remarks were correct, they should turn their attention, not to orthodoxy, which had a faith and was satisfied with it, but to indifference and unbelief and sin, which had it not, and were satisfied without it. He concluded by moving "that this Meeting, in professing its attachment to Unitarian Christianity, as at once Scriptural and Rational, and conducive to the true glory of God and Well-being of Men, and in avowing its veneration for the early British Expositors and Confessors of this Faith, — at the same time recognises the

essential worth of that principle of free inquiry to which we are indebted for our own form of Christianity, and of that Spirit of deep and vital Religion which may exist under various forms of theological sentiment, and which gave to our forefathers their implicit faith in Truth, their love of God, and their reliance, for the improvement of mankind, on the influences of the Gospel." This was seconded by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, and carried. The resolution relating to the Unitarian Association was also carried; and the Meeting was brought to a close with the usual votes of thanks.

On the 29th of November, 1838, he removed from Mount Street, where three children had been added to his family, to a more commodious residence, with a garden and greenhouse. Of this transaction he gives an amusing account: —

"In 1838 we removed to a larger house, in Mason Street, Edgehill, next door to Dr. Raffles, who was always a pleasant neighbour. In the same terrace lived Rev. Mr. Hull, the liberal incumbent of the Church for the Blind. The street for the most part belonged to an eccentric old man, who picked his tenants by unaccountable whims of fancy. On my applying for the house, he kept me in suspense while he catechised me in the drollest way to find out who I was: at last, he said, 'Yes, Sir, you shall have it: and then with the Rev. Mr. Hull, the Rev. Dr. Raffles, and the Rev. Mr. Martineau, it will be strange if we have not a trinity that will keep the devil out of the street.' On the credit of this function I remained there seven years; and there my youngest son and daughter were born." [1]

Early in 1839 began what was subsequently known as the "Liverpool Controversy." It was undertaken by thirteen clergymen of the Church of England, and was started by the publication of a letter addressed by the Rev. Fielding Ould, minister of Christ Church, "to all who call themselves Unitarians in the town and neighbourhood of Liverpool," in which they were invited to come and give a patient hear-

[1] Bi. Mem.

ing to a course of lectures designed to "expose the false philosophy and dangerous unsoundness of the Unitarian system." Although this letter speaks of "the controversial discussion of disputed points," and says it is a pleasant thing "to tell and to hear together of the great things which our God has done for our souls," it seems clear that no mutual discussion was intended. The telling was to be all on one side, and the hearing on the other; for it is assumed throughout that God had done nothing for the souls of Unitarians. However, the phrases used were not unnaturally misunderstood, and regarded as an invitation to a public discussion, on both sides, of the questions at issue; and the challenge was accordingly taken up by the three Unitarian ministers of Liverpool, James Martineau, J. H. Thom, and Henry Giles, minister of the Ancient Chapel, Toxteth Park. The second of these names is not so widely known as that of Martineau; but we have already seen what kind of man he was, and that, whatever errors of belief might be ascribed to him, he was a man of profound and saintly soul, imbued with the finest spirit of Christian faith. Mr. Giles, though not without brilliant points, cannot be compared in mental or spiritual stature with the other two. These gentlemen addressed a letter to the thirteen clergymen, which led to a long and unsatisfactory correspondence, the details of which we need not follow.[1] Suffice it to say that all proposals to present the arguments on both

[1] The letters are all reprinted in the volume containing the lectures, published, with a "General Preface," in 1839, under the title of "Unitarianism Defended." An account of the controversy is given by the Rev. Charles Wicksteed in the "Theological Review," January, 1877, and this, it would seem, is the first notice that appeared in any periodical circulating among Unitarians. As Dr. Martineau says in a letter to Mr. Wicksteed, Nov. 20, 1876: "We were too 'advanced' to be deemed safe objects of notice, yet were thrown into a position where it would hardly have been loyal to make us objects of critical attack." In Dr. Martineau's interesting account of the theological differences between himself and Mr. Thom, in the Memorial Preface to "A Spiritual Faith" before referred to, his recollections seem slightly tinged by the colours of his later thought.

sides through a common medium to the same public were unavailing. There is no reason to doubt that Mr. Ould and his coadjutors were animated by the most charitable intentions, and that the language of insult did not spring from an insolent spirit, but was the inevitable expression of their false theology, which taught them to trust in themselves that they were righteous and to despise others, and to treat such men as Martineau and Thom, and many of the noblest citizens of Liverpool, as tremblers on the verge of hell.

One passage may be quoted, as indicating the general theological position maintained by the three Unitarians: "We believe, no less than you, in an infallible Revelation (though had we the misfortune to doubt it, we might be, in the sight of God, neither worse nor better than yourselves); you in a Revelation of an unintelligible Creed to the understanding; we in a Revelation of moral perfection, and the spirit of duty to the heart; you in a Revelation of the metaphysics of Deity; we in a Revelation of the character and providence of the Infinite Father; you in a Redemption which saves the few, and leaves with Hell the triumph after all; we in a Redemption which shall restore to all at length the image and the immortality of God; we *do* reserve, as you suggest, '*a sort of inspiration*' for the founders of Christianity, 'a sort,' as much higher than your cold, dogmatical, scientific inspiration, as the intuitions of conscience are higher than the predications of logic, and the free spirit of God, than the petty precision of men. We believe in a spiritual and moral Revelation, most awakening, most sanctifying, most holy; which *words,* being the signs of hard and definite ideas, could never express, and which is therefore pourtrayed in a mind divinely finished for the purpose, acting awhile on Earth and publicly transferred to Heaven." [1]

[1] Correspondence, p. 41.

On the 3d of February, the Sunday before the lectures began, Mr. Martineau preached a sermon on "Peace I leave with you," and subsequently gave an unwritten address to the congregation, announcing his intention of hearing the Christ Church lectures, and exhorting the people to do so too. The lectures on the Trinitarian side were delivered on Wednesday evenings, and occupied the hours from 6.30 till 11; and the Unitarian reply was given on the following Tuesday. The excitement was so great that the three Unitarian ministers had extreme difficulty in getting admission to the opening lecture. Afterwards they occupied "the condemned pew" which was reserved for them, and bore, says Mr. Martineau, "as quietly as we could the declamatory denunciation or the whining pity showered upon us, amid the responsive groans of the pious audience, by the energy or the feebleness of the preacher."[1] The clergy succeeded in keeping away their own people, with few exceptions, from the Unitarian rejoinders; but nevertheless Paradise Street Chapel was crowded during the earlier lectures; and though the attendance afterwards fell off, it still exceeded the measure of a good Sunday morning's congregation.

Of the thirteen lectures Mr. Martineau delivered five; and with these alone we are at present concerned. The first, delivered on Tuesday, February 19, was entitled "The Bible: what it is and what it is not." The general thesis of the lecture, that the inspiration of the authors does not guarantee their infallibility, which was then regarded as blasphemous heresy, has now become almost a commonplace of theology; and it is unnecessary to follow the treatment in detail. But one or two points may be selected which illustrate the history of Mr. Martineau's opinions. He arranges in the following order the probabilities in behalf of the authenticity (or, as we now commonly say, the genuineness)

[1] From the letter to Wicksteed.

of the several books of the New Testament: "1. The letters of St. Paul (excepting Hebrews) occupy the highest station of evidence. 2. The remaining letters, excepting 2 Peter and Hebrews again, I should place next. 3. The Gospel of St. John is more certainly authentic than the other three; which, however, would follow in the 4th place, with the book of Acts. And the list will be closed by 5. The Apocalypse, 2 Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews." [1] It will be observed how widely this differs from the hypotheses of Baur, which at a later period affected so deeply Dr. Martineau's criticism. He fully accepts the reality of miracles, but assigns them a different place from that which they occupy in the "Evidences of Christianity." He says: "Miracles are simply awakening facts: demanding and securing reverential and watchful regard to something, or to everything, in the parties performing them; but not specifically singling out any portion of their doctrinal ideas, and affording them infallible proof." [2] His view of Christ is described in a passage of great beauty. The essential parts are conveyed in the following sentences: "These writings introduce me to a Being so unimaginable, except by the great Inventor of beauty and Architect of nature himself, that I embrace him at once, as having all the reality of man and the divinest inspiration of God." "It is the very spirit of Deity visible on the scale of humanity. The colours of his mind, projected on the surface of Infinitude, form there the all-perfect God." [3] This view is presented with greater explicitness in his subsequent lecture, "The Proposition 'that Christ is God,' proved to be false from the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures." He says: "Christ possessed and manifested all the *moral* attributes of Deity." These were "compressed, in Christ, within the physical and intellectual limits of humanity." Trinitarians "add one other ingredient to the conception,

[1] P. 14, with the Errata prefixed to Lecture V. [2] P. 26. [3] P. 6–8.

viz., that he possessed the physical and intellectual attributes of Deity; — that he is to be esteemed no less eternal, omnipotent and omnipresent, than the Infinite Father," — an addition which the Unitarian believes to be unwarranted.[1] His regard, at that time, for the Fourth Gospel receives further illustration in this lecture: "Let us turn to the Proem of St. John's Gospel; that most venerable and beautiful of all the delineations which Scripture furnishes of the twofold relation of Christ's spirit, to the Father who gave it its illumination, and to the brethren who were blessed by its light." [2]

His next lecture, the sixth in the series, was on "The Scheme of Vicarious Redemption inconsistent with itself, and with the Christian Idea of Salvation." This was so extended after delivery that it forms a treatise on the doctrine of atonement. Perhaps the most suggestive part is where he points out that the passages supposed to teach the atoning efficacy of the cross do not appear till after the beginning of the Gentile controversy. Christ's death was necessary in order to change him from a Jewish Messiah into a universal spirit, and thus it was by his blood that the Gentiles were "brought nigh," and justified. Hence it is that the resurrection is dwelt upon much more than the death, and that the former, but never the latter, is made the object of faith. The Jews, moreover, were not unaffected, for Christ, through his death, postponed the full assumption of his Messianic prerogative, and so left time for them to repent. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ's death is represented as taking the place of the Jewish sacrifices, serving as a commutation for the Mosaic law and atoning once for all for the abandonment of its ritual precepts.[3]

The next lecture, on "The Christian View of Moral Evil,"

---

[1] P. 6. [2] P. 28 *sq.*

[3] This lecture is reprinted, but without the notes, in "Studies of Christianity," 1858.

is of a more purely philosophical cast, and must be noticed elsewhere. It is replete with moral earnestness, and shows how profoundly Mr. Martineau's thought and life were affected by the revelations of conscience. In the strictly theological portion he considers the biblical representations of Satan, and views the demonology of the Gospels, not as a conscious accommodation to error, but as expressing the writers' sincere adoption of current ideas, which was not overruled by their inspiration. His general conclusion is that moral evil is not the *instrument,* but the *enemy* of God; and if we still ask, "*Whence* this foe?" no answer can be given. "All the ingenuities of logic and of language leave it a mystery still: and it is better to stand within the darkness in the quietude of faith, than vainly to search for its margin in the restlessness of knowledge."

His last lecture, delivered on the 14th of May, on "Christianity without Priest, and without Ritual,"[1] closes the series. He portrays in vivid language the functions of the priest and the prophet; the former the representative of men before God, the great magician who dispenses a system of consecrated charms; the latter "the representative of God before men, commissioned from the Divine nature to sanctify the human," and fulfilling his mission only "when he brings the finite mind and the infinite into immediate and thrilling contact, and leaves the creature consciously alone with the Creator." He then proceeds to show that the Church of England is in general conformity with the ritual or sacerdotal conception of religion, and that Christianity in its origin belongs entirely to the prophetic type. The lecture concludes with some general remarks on the controversy, which had now reached its termination. In the course of these remarks the following account is given of the positive teaching of Unitarians: "All Unitarian writers

[1] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity."

maintain the Moral Perfection and Fatherly Providence of the Infinite Ruler; the Messiahship of Jesus Christ, in whose person and spirit there is a Revelation of God and a Sanctification for Man; the Responsibility and Retributive Immortality of men; and the need of a pure and devout heart of Faith, as the source of all outward goodness and inward communion with God." He explains the refusal of Unitarians to embody their sentiments in any authoritative formula in words which express the abiding conviction of his life: "The peculiarity has had its origin in hereditary and historical associations; but it has its defence in the noblest principles of religious freedom and Christian communion. At present, it must suffice to say, that our societies are dedicated, not to theological opinions, but to religious worship; that they have maintained the unity of the spirit, without insisting on any union of doctrine; that Christian liberty, love, and piety are their essentials in perpetuity, but their Unitarianism an accident of a few or many generations, — which has arisen, and might vanish, without the loss of their identity. We believe in the mutability of religious systems, but the imperishable character of the religious affections; in the progressiveness of opinion within, as well as without, the limits of Christianity. Our forefathers cherished the same conviction; and so, not having been born intellectual bondsmen, we desire to leave our successors free. Convinced that uniformity of doctrine can never prevail, we seek to attain its only good — peace on earth and communion with Heaven — without it. We aim to make a true Christendom, — a commonwealth of the faithful, — by the binding force, not of ecclesiastical creeds, but of spiritual wants and Christian sympathies; and indulge the vision of a Church that 'in the latter days shall arise,' like 'the mountain of the Lord,' bearing on its ascent the blossoms of thought proper to every intellectual clime, and withal massively rooted in the deep places of our hu-

manity, and gladly rising to meet the sunshine from on high." [1]

The lectures which have been thus briefly described rose far above the ordinary level of controversial pamphlets, and are serious contributions to the subjects of which they treat. They were produced with great rapidity in the midst of pressing engagements which would have sufficiently taxed the strength of ordinary men; but there is no sign of this in their composition. There are passages marked by great splendour of language; the thought is always clear and forcible, and the learning adequate; and above all, there is a moral and spiritual fervour which shows how the writer was possessed by the greatness of his themes, and, in spite of not a little provocation, there is always a dignified courtesy towards his opponents. Whether the thirteen clergymen ever had the smallest perception of the mental and spiritual stature of the men they were attacking does not appear; but there is one little incident which it is pleasant to record. Mr. Martineau, in the second lecture, had charged Archbishop Magee with "a mass of abuse the most coarse, and misrepresentation the most black." This was described by Dr. Byrth as "an outrage on the memory of departed greatness"; and accordingly Mr. Martineau, in a note to the sixth lecture, produced the evidence which justified his statement. The result was that Dr. Byrth wrote a private letter in which he said that if any expressions of his at all resembled those which had been quoted from Magee's book, he "could wish them obliterated by tears of contrition," and he promised to take an opportunity of publicly declaring his disapproval of the Archbishop's style of controversy. Further friendly letters were exchanged; and Dr. Byrth presented Mr. Martineau with a fine copy of Gerard's (*sic.*? Gerhard's) edition of the Greek Testament,

[1] The whole series of lectures was reissued in their original form by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in 1876.

with the autographs in it of Newcome Cappe and his wife.[1]

In July of the same year he received tidings of the severe and sudden illness of his sister Harriet in Italy or Switzerland, and he and his brother-in-law, Mr. Alfred Higginson, immediately started in search of her. Their anxiety was soon relieved by a letter from a friend, reporting a vast improvement; and after a short absence on the continent they were able to return with her to England, and send her safely on her journey to Newcastle.

On the 1st of September, 1839, Mr. Martineau preached a sermon, entitled "The Outer and the Inner Temple,"[2] at the opening of Upper Brook Street Chapel, Manchester, where the Rev. J. J. Tayler, who was afterwards for many years his revered friend and colleague, was minister. This sermon, besides the intrinsic beauty of its spiritual pleading, contains ideas which are interesting in relation to his later views. He pronounces, as the keynote of his thought, "*this is a Church of God's Messiah*"; and he proceeds to show that there are two conceptions of the Messiah, God's and man's, which are perpetually coming into collision. "We all believe that, at the birth of Christianity, Heaven's great Messiah actually came." In opposition to Jewish expectations "the great Father rebukes every plan of partial and exclusive deliverance," and "the cross, which was to disown him [Jesus] as the Messiah of Jerusalem, made him the Messiah of mankind." Accordingly the church must be dedicated "to an *impartial Messiah,* and a *universal Gospel,*" and "the objects which should be *loved*" must "for ever transcend the notions that should be *thought.*" Yet worship would be conformed to a definite system of belief, and "it is impossible to be impressed with the Personal Unity, the Moral Perfection, the Univer-

[1] From a letter of Martineau's to Rev. C. Wicksteed, Nov. 20, 1876.
[2] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

sal Paternity of God; to recognise Christ as *morally* though not *physically* Divine; to feel the personal nature of sin and holiness, alienable by no transfer, and attainable by no miracle; to see in prospect, however distant, the guilt and suffering of men worn out, and every wanderer gathered back into the divine embrace; without desiring to supplant with these great ideas the harsher and more repulsive conceptions endeared by ecclesiastical tradition." Nevertheless "we look with unaffected veneration on every mode of Christian belief, and are persuaded that no soul that makes faithful use of any, shall die from dearth of the daily bread of life." But we hope for unity at last, "a unity, however, more deep-seated and affectionate than that of mere opinion; a unity of allegiance to one Father, and toil for one Brotherhood, and reverence for one law of Duty, and aspiration for one home in Heaven; the universal church of good and faithful souls, adorning God's providence with varieties of thought, and strengthening it by consentaneousness of love."

Early on the 13th of September another son was born; and the happy father says in a letter: "The baby is reported to be a famous fellow in point of size; and by his strength of lungs he appears to be a candidate for the pulpit." These infantine aspirations, however, were not retained.

A change was now at hand which was to have an important bearing on the rest of Mr. Martineau's life. In 1828 University College, or, as it was at first called, the University of London, was opened in order to provide the highest education without imposing a test of religious opinions. In 1834 it sought for the privilege of granting degrees; and this application led to the institution of the existing University of London as an examining body, with power to grant degrees to candidates who had studied in affiliated colleges, not necessarily situated in London. The advantages thus conferred upon Dissenters naturally attracted

young laymen away from York; and for some years before the time which we have reached there was a wide and growing dissatisfaction, not indeed with the admirable men who directed the studies at Manchester New College, but with the inevitable seclusion of students for the ministry, the want of association and competition with men training for other professions, and the narrowness of their social circle, which tended to cramp their minds and deaden their aspirations. Things were thus ripe for change when Mr. Kenrick, who was suffering from a weakness in his eyes, sent in his resignation. On the 4th of April, 1838, the general Committee of the College appointed a sub-committee to make inquiries respecting the course to be adopted. A circular was prepared, and opinions confidentially invited as to three plans which presented themselves: 1. Remaining at York; 2. Removing to Manchester; 3. Establishing a chair or chairs of theology in London, and sending the students to University College for their arts course. The first was almost universally, and without hesitation, rejected, as quite unsuited to existing requirements. In favour of the third scheme there were very weighty opinions, expressed in a broad, and what may be called a statesmanlike spirit. The Rev. J. J. Tayler, one of the secretaries of the College, was strongly in favour of a removal to London. Mr. Martineau, who was Mr. Tayler's colleague in the secretaryship from 1839 to 1840, supported the Manchester scheme. His reasons may be quoted from a letter to Mr. Edgar Taylor, dated Jan. 19, 1839: —

"You cannot wonder that our friends in the North require a strong case of expediency, to reconcile them to the removal from among them of a College, which, in one form or other, has always existed in this neighbourhood; which has all its property in Yorkshire and Lancashire; and derives by far the greater part of its support from these and the adjoining counties. Is it altogether a local prejudice which leads them to imagine, that in these manufacturing and commercial parts,

the true Non-con. spirit maintains itself in greater vigour than in London, and connects itself naturally with the qualities which raise men to influence in such towns as Manchester and Liverpool? It has always appeared to me, that our body in London exists in a somewhat disorganised state, and is composed largely of accidental elements, contributed mainly by the country; that the most able and judicious, as well as opulent, of its members, are not those into whose hands the control of its ecclesiastical affairs is likely to fall; and that the sacrifice of money and time, requisite for the energetic maintenance of voluntary institutions, are necessarily more foreign to London than to provincial habits. I say this without the slightest hint of reproach. The difference arises from permanently different states of society: if it did not, but were the *fault of persons,* it would be of no weight in the present argument; as *with the persons* it would pass away.

"Calculations of expense too, which have been carefully made, present great difficulties in the way of a removal to London. . . . But none of these considerations would have much weight, if London were the only place, where candidates could be prepared for the degrees of the London University. It is conceived, however, that the College could obtain from the Privy Council the privilege of sending its students up to the University examinations. With this advantage, and with a disinterested avoidance of everything sectarian in the appointment to the non-theological chairs, it is thought that the academy might even become an object of general resort, as a Provincial College.

"These reasons have induced me to think less favourably of the London scheme, than I did on a first view of the case."

For several months a special committee sat in London to assist the deliberations of the regular committee in Manchester; and finally an address was issued giving a summary of the merits of the only two schemes which invited serious attention, and asking for an expression of opinion on the pending question. The decisive meetings were held in Cross Street Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on Thursday and Friday, the 19th and 20th of December, 1839, when a majority of two voted in favour of a removal to Manchester. The written opinions of the supporters of the College, how-

ever, added greatly to the weight of this small majority, as they advocated the same conclusion in the proportion of more than two to one.

On the 13th of July, 1839, Mr. G. W. Wood, M.P. for Kendal, had been able to report, in a letter to Mrs. Martineau, that he had that morning spoken to Lord John Russell on the subject of the affiliation of the College to the University of London; that the suggestion was favourably received, and the open constitution of the College regarded with approval. A Memorial was prepared and numerously signed by supporters of the College, "praying that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to connect Manchester New College with the University of London"; and on the 21st of January, 1840, this was presented by seven members of Parliament through the Marquis of Normanby, Secretary of State for the Home Department. The petition was granted, and the Royal Warrant was signed on the 28th of February. The way was thus prepared for enlarging the scope of the College, and making it a centre of higher education for the Manchester district. The theological chairs were as little pledged to foregone conclusions as any of the others; but as the very fact of their impartiality might seem to give them a denominational tinge, the theological department was kept strictly separate from that of the arts and science, and it was hoped that the latter would receive general support, and secure for the College a higher and more public position than it had hitherto succeeded in occupying.[1] The committee acquired a commodious house, which had formerly been the property and residence of a leading Presbyterian family of Marslands. This house stood in Grosvenor Square, at the corner of Stretford New Road (then Cavendish Street), and, being a fine old mansion, with good rooms on two floors, as well as a concert

[1] The foregoing account is drawn from numerous letters and documents of the time.

or ball-room, afforded ample provision for the library, and for professors' and students' rooms, as well as class-rooms and a common hall. It was not designed for residence; and the students who had not their homes in Manchester lived in lodgings of their own selection. The house is still there, and contains the city offices of one of the great Poor Law Unions.

The College was opened in October, 1840, with a staff of eight professors, and a lecturer on the French language and literature. As more intimately connected with the subject of this memoir may be named the Rev. J. J. Tayler, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Mr. F. W. Newman, Professor of the Greek, Latin, and English languages. Mr. Martineau himself was appointed Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy and Political Economy. This appointment, while enabling him to relinquish most of his private classes, did not require his presence in Manchester more than once a week,[1] when, on Wednesday afternoons, he delivered two or three consecutive lectures. There was indeed one disadvantage in this arrangement; it limited the intercourse between the professor and his students, and practically restricted his efforts to the reading of an elaborately written exposition of philosophical problems. He gave his public inaugural lecture on Wednesday, the 7th of October. In the volume of "Introductory Lectures," published at the time, this lecture is without a descriptive title; but in the reprint in the fourth volume of the Essays Dr. Martineau has called it "Scope of Mental and Moral Philosophy," and these words may sufficiently indicate its subject. In a letter written to Mr. Martineau on the 21st of May, 1841, Mr. J. S. Mill, in acknowledging the volume of opening lectures, indulged "the happiest forebodings" of the work of the institution, from the soundness of its fun-

[1] The Biographical Memoranda say "two days in the week," but a contemporary letter shows that his memory was at fault.

damental principles and the qualifications of its professors. He offered to ensure insertion in the "Westminster Review" for any article which Mr. Martineau might write in exposition and vindication of the principle of free teaching and free learning, of which Manchester New College was the unique representative. It may be added that the first session gave good promise of success, eleven divinity and seventeen lay students having entered.

The excitement of controversy, and regard for the welfare of the College, had not deadened Mr. Martineau's early interest in the hymns to be used in worship. The preface of the first edition of "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home" is dated June 20, 1840, and the book was introduced into his own Chapel on the 1st of November in the same year. On this occasion he delivered a sermon on "The Communion of Saints," which is printed in the first volume of the "Endeavours after the Christian Life." The keynote of the preface is struck in the opening words: "Worship is an attitude which our nature assumes, not *for a purpose,* but *from an emotion*"; and this idea is opposed to the utilitarian, whether in its sacerdotal or its rationalistic form. He wished every hymn to be referred to a suitable tune, and, according to the recollection of one of his daughters, he went regularly through the book with his young son Russell, who played the tunes, while he himself sang the hymns, and so decided on the suitability of the music. The volume met a widely felt want, and in the course of years appeared in several editions, and in different sizes adapted to different tastes; but its success at first was not rapid, for on March 10, 1843, there is a note recording a loss of upwards of £50 by the hymn book.

Early in 1841 he completed a series of ten sermons on St. Paul. A wish was expressed for their publication; but that was refused for the time, as he was contemplating the early issue of a mixed volume. Towards the close of

the year he announced his intention of supplementing the "Rationale" by treating, on alternate Sundays, of the question, "What is Christianity?" This treatment formed part of his original plan, and was still in view when he published the first volume of the "Endeavours." His admirers must regret that, in spite of his own "sense of their inadequacy," these two sets of sermons have never seen the light. Some account of the sermons on Paul will be given presently.

A very interesting essay was published, in the "Christian Teacher," [1] in the course of the year, entitled "Five Points of Christian Faith." [2] The object of the essay, which is somewhat polemical in tone, is to relieve the anxiety occasioned by the unbelief of the time, and by the "impending revolution in the forms of Christian faith"; and with this view it aims at showing "what principles of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular, may be pronounced safe from the shocks of doubt." The outline of Christian truths thus traced is simply "Unitarian Christianity, . . . exhibiting both its characteristic faiths, and something of the modes of thought by which they are reached." His own summary of the results may be quoted: "Here, then, are our Five Points of Christianity, considered as a system of positive religious doctrine, viz.: 1st. The truth of the Moral Perceptions in man, — not, as the degenerate churches of our day teach, their pravity and blindness; 2dly. The Moral Perfection of the character of God, — in opposition to the doctrine of his Arbitrary Decrees and Absolute Self-will; 3dly. The Natural awakening of the Divine Spirit within us, — rather than its Preternatural communication from without; 4thly. Christ, the pure Image and highest Revelation of the Eternal Father, — not his Victim and his Contrast; 5thly. A uni-

[1] Vol. III, New Series, p. 444 *sqq*.
[2] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity."

versal Immortality after the model of Christ's heavenly life; an immortality not of capricious and select salvation, with unimaginable torment as the general lot, but, for all, a life of spiritual development, of retribution, of restoration." As indicating the sources of Mr. Martineau's own faith the following passages are significant: "It is far from being the clear and acute intellect, but rather the pure and transparent heart, that best discerns God"; "the Intellect alone, like the telescope waiting for an observer, is quite blind to the celestial things above it." But while he had the profoundest belief in the conscience and moral affections as the "only *internal* revealers" of God, he accepted Christ as "*his perfect and transcendant outward revelation,*" because "Christ, standing in solitary greatness, and invested with unapproachable sanctity, opens at once the eye of conscience to perceive and know the pure and holy God, the Father that dwelt in him and made him so full of truth and grace." His view of the authority of Christ's teaching is thus stated: — the knowledge of God "which any mind (be it of man or of angel) may possess, is just proportioned to its sanctity: and our Messiah, having the very highest sanctity, was enabled to speak with the highest and most authoritative knowledge, and was inspired to be our infallible guide, not perhaps in trivial questions of literary interpretation, or scientific fact, or historical expectation, but in all the deep and solemn relations on which our sanctification and immortal blessedness depend."

In the summer of 1842 another little daughter was added to the household. This event furnishes a good opportunity for presenting a charming family picture sketched by the pen of Mrs. Martineau. It occurs in a letter written the following Good Friday, April 14, 1843. "Mr. Thom has done me a world of good to-day by a beautiful Good Friday sermon on Gethsemane, — Christ over his sleeping disciples, with his yearning heart and surrendered will and his oneness

with God! I love these occasional services and these Christian festival days more and more intensely the older I grow. Never did I think the whole story more divine than in telling it to my four to-night, — to my poor Herbert for the first time: and, as Isabella said to me, 'Mamma, reading the New Testament is not like anything else that one reads, for we always find something new, and are never tired of it.' Oh, for a picture of Herbert's little changing face as he heard for the first time the tale of the crucifixion. It inspired me to tell it better, I think, than I ever did before; and he went to bed in a delicious agitation which I envied from my soul."

At this time Mrs. Martineau's hands were full of extra work, sending out seven hundred circulars announcing the "Endeavours," and copying the sermons for the press. The volume, which has since taken its place as an English classic in homiletic literature, appeared in the summer. The preface, which is dated June 20, 1843, explains briefly the reasons for withholding the discourses on the question "What is Christianity?" which he had in contemplation when he published the "Rationale." He was influenced partly by a change in some of his views, and the consciousness of immaturity in others, but chiefly by a desire to lay aside for a while the polemical character which necessity had impressed on his former writings, and which misrepresented the order of his convictions, "engaging him upon the outward form of Christian belief, while silent of the inner heart of human life and faith." At the same time he held out hopes of a second volume devoted especially "to the Divine Ministry of Christ," and a third on the Christianity of Paul. It is not necessary to attempt any description of sermons which have found their way into so many hearts. They must hold their place so long as there are men who can look beyond the trappings into the secret soul of religion, and who can appreciate nobility of thought

expressed in noble language, fervour of sentiment, depth of spiritual insight, and humble aspiration after perfect communion with God.

He spent his next vacation at Rivington; and we now hear of his "resolute total abstinence," which he had adopted "as a provisional instrument for the arrest of most serious social evils." While we are referring to this subject, we may so far anticipate as to notice a speech which he delivered at Patricroft in 1845, under the chairmanship of Mr. Holbrook Gaskell. He thought teetotalers manifested a "superstitious abhorrence" towards the substance alcohol, "instead of directing that abhorrence towards the moral vice in the mind of the drinker." But as a cure for enormous evils total abstinence was necessary, and for many years he had adopted the practice in his own person and family. Though the physiological effects of alcohol were exaggerated, he fully believed that its use was mischievous rather than beneficial. He believed it was the proper and true course for everyone to abstain entirely, for the sake of those to whom it proved too strong a temptation. It was a little sacrifice; for "persons would be better in health, clearer in mind, and almost all the functions of life, on which physical enjoyment depends, would go on as well or better." But he did not like the pledge; and he thought it of the utmost consequence, in drawing men from vicious pleasures, to provide that refreshment which man requires, and combine plans of amusement and instruction.[1] It may be mentioned here that throughout his life he was a non-smoker, and was so sensitive to the fumes of tobacco that he experienced serious discomfort if he was in a room where others were smoking.

---

[1] The speech was reported at considerable length in the "Truthseeker Temperance Advocate," from which it was reproduced in "The Inquirer," 1895, p. 276. My attention was called to this by the Rev. W. Harrison, of Stalybridge. — J. D.

On Tuesday, the 13th of August, 1844, the family removed to a new house in Prince's Park. This was in contemplation as early as April in the previous year. Mr. Richard Yates had projected the Park, and, on the refusal of the Corporation to take the responsibility, purchased the land himself. Here Mr. Martineau was induced to buy a plot of land, and to build a house, which he named Park Nook. The money required for the building was kindly advanced by his friends the Misses Yates, to be repaid as convenient, and secured upon the house. Before the end of August a contract was finally settled, and the excavations begun.

"The planning and progress of the scheme was," says Mr. Martineau, "a constant source of interest and amusement in the family for upwards of a year; especially as the rapid slope of the ground involved a terrace-garden, and a story more behind than before, and a mysterious tunnel-passage from the back door, and other first rate provisions for 'hide-and-seek.' Hither we removed in 1845 [this is a mistake for 1844]: and though the increased distance from town was sometimes inconvenient, the ampler space, the perfect quiet, the pure air, the outlook on grass and foliage and flowers, and the vicinity of some of our best friends, especially the good sisters Yates of Farmfield, far outweighed in benefit the added tax upon time and exertion." [1]

The change to better air must have been all the more delightful, as the removal was preceded by "an unrefreshing and even depressing holiday period," which left him but poorly at the end.

Among the earliest visitors at the new house was Theodore Parker, whose heresies at that time were regarded with horror by a large number of Unitarians. Nevertheless he preached on the 18th of August for Mr. Martineau, who, however, was prevented from hearing him owing to his own absence in Leeds. This statement is taken from a

[1] Bi. Mem.

letter written that very day by Mrs. Martineau, and it is connected with a curious instance of erroneous memory which, for its psychological interest is worth recording. In 1876 a question was raised as to the reception of Theodore Parker by Unitarians, and some correspondence was printed about it in "The Inquirer." On December 29 Dr. Martineau wrote: "On one insignificant point my 'distinct recollection' respecting Theodore Parker's Sunday in Liverpool does not agree with my friend Mr. Thom's. I was not absent from home, but attended the morning service at Paradise Street Chapel. Parker's preaching left its vivid image in my memory, and I had no other opportunity of hearing him." A friend convinced him of his mistake, and a few days later, January 3, he wrote: "It is due to my friend, Mr. Thom, that, having discovered the superior accuracy of his memory, I should retract my letter of last week, and confirm, in full, his account of Theodore Parker's Sunday in Liverpool. . . . I cannot have been in Liverpool on that day; and if, as I believe, it was the 25th August, I find that I must have been at Chester for both morning and evening service. For the lively image that I have of Parker's preaching I can account only by supposing that I constructed it from descriptions given me by my friends, interpreted by my personal knowledge of the man; unless, indeed, he preached for me twice — on his arrival in 1843, as well as on his way home in 1844 — and I have no trace of such earlier visit. My error shows, by a new instance, how difficult it is to prevent imagination going shares with memory in the production of history."

It is now necessary to touch upon a painful subject, which one would willingly pass over if it had not already become public property. It is well known that Miss Harriet Martineau, who had "adored" her brother James, was in her later life alienated from him; and it has been generally supposed that this estrangement was altogether caused by

a review of the "Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development," by Henry George Atkinson and Harriet Martineau, which was published in 1851. But private correspondence shows that its beginning is of much older date. As far back as November, 1844, Mrs. Martineau "confesses herself too deeply distressed by Harriet's present state of mind to be willing to write about it"; and in the following January speaks with indignation of her "whole demeanour towards us since the correspondence-mandate was issued and disobeyed." The reference in these words requires some explanation. Miss Martineau had the gravest objection to the publication of private correspondence, which she regarded as a violation of holy confidence. The question is fully discussed in her "Life in the Sick Room," [1] where the arguments are deeply earnest, and, many will think, cogent. How this opinion affected her relations with her brother may be described in the words of the latter: —

"She had becomed possessed by the conviction that it was a breach of private confidence not to destroy friendly correspondence as fast as it arose; and, besides acting on this principle herself, had demanded the sacrifice of all her letters at the hands of those to whom they were addressed. Against this severe exaction I had remonstrated in vain. It would have wrenched from me a large portion of those treasures of memory which often yield the chief revenue of solace and affection in old age, and which cannot consistently be given in trust, to be withdrawn in distrust. The only option left to me was, to cancel the old letters, or to receive no new ones. I looked over my stores, and made my choice with sadness, but with decision. The latter correspondence had not been quite like the earlier. Still bright, frank, eager about kindly offices, and disinterested ends, they had become short, summary and dictatorial: and touched condescendingly, if at all, on the subjects of thought and work of life which remained of supreme interest to me. In cases of divergent opinion they betrayed a sharp impatience which gave notice that any

[1] P. 77 *sqq.*

exchange of ideas was useless, and that the condition of happy intercourse must be the suppression of all serious dissent from her judgments. I could not conceal from myself the change which had insensibly modified our relation and rendered its old style of confidences impossible: and I chose, if so it must be, to forfeit the future rather than the past. Except in the matter of correspondence, there was no active difference: she had been at my house, and I at hers: but such opportunities were rare; and the long silences between left it possible for vast changes of feeling to mature themselves on one side, without reporting themselves to the other."

But although pleasant intercourse had become impossible ever since the letter-burning mandate, there was another cause of vexation. This was the time when Miss Martineau was engaged in controversy with Mr. Greenhow about her malady and its cure by mesmerism. Her brother was quite unable to concur in her views; but he neither published nor volunteered any expression of his opinion, and simply claimed to be let alone in having it. She seems, however, to have made a difference of opinion a source of personal offence, and to have believed too readily what are characterised as "injurious fictions" about him. Her mind was evidently excited and morbid; and Mrs. Martineau's sister, who endeavoured to present things to her in a truer light, writes: "Everything convinces me to demonstration that all attempts to give her just views of your conduct and feelings would be worse than useless." This is about six years before the appearance of the Atkinson Letters. In 1846, however, some reconciliation took place; for Mr. Martineau had a serious conversation with his sister, during a visit of the latter to Liverpool, on the causes of change in their relations, in which he disclaimed all action except in self-defence against some demand or statement initiated by her. This proved at least so far satisfactory that she afterwards met some friends at dinner at Park Nook, and subjects of difference were by common consent avoided.

The year 1845 was not without other trials. A minor one was the reduction of his College salary to £100 a year, which obliged him to resume some of his private teaching. He soon had three separate engagements, with either a single pupil or small classes of two and three. A much more afflicting source of anxiety was the serious illness of their "lovely Herbert." The little patient suffered no pain, slept well, and had natural enjoyment of his reading and amusements; but if occasional improvement revived the hopes of his parents, they were soon dashed again by his increasing weakness and the continuance of feverish symptoms. "Mamma," he said one day, "do you not find these days very tiresome?" and again, "I never miss praying to God for you, that you may not be quite overdone with nursing me." He had set his heart on giving a paper-knife to Sir Arnold Knight, and when he presented it the kind physician could only say "Dear little fellow," as he turned away to hide his tears. As his strength declined, his patience and sweetness increased; and almost to the last he found pleasure in a collection of shells which he was engaged in classifying. The rest of the pathetic story must be told in his father's words.

On the 4th of February, 1846, he wrote to Mr. Thom: —

"Our little invalid continues in a state which allows of but very faint hopes of his restoration to us here. His decline is the realisation of a sorrow which, with a secret premonitory superstition, I have always anticipated. There is something in the boy's nature so deep and beautiful, and so unlike anything I have ever noticed elsewhere, that the instinctive feeling has never left me, that he was ill adapted for the conditions of this life. But the wasting hours of transition are hard to bear; — not from any shadow of doubt or fear, which never comes across our faith that all is well, but from mere human love and pity, baffled by the visible decline, and shrinking from the real farewell."

The following paragraph is from the Biographical Memoranda: —

"Our boy Herbert, — a child so delicately made and of such rare beauty that we had often wondered at his habitual good health, — was . . . visited by some internal complaint which long remained mysterious, but at last declared itself to be fatal. We had barely realised what was before us, ere he was seized in the night of the 28th of March, 1846, with a sudden paroxysm, and died in my arms. I will not dwell upon the fair promise which in that moment withered for this world: I should be supposed to speak under the idealising influence of time. Yet all who knew him were struck and fascinated, not only by his personal grace, but by his quick intelligence, his transparent undulations of feeling, above all, his intuitive apprehension of beauty and expression in form, colour, tone, and character. A remarkable evidence of the impression which his winning nature produced was afforded by an incident in the life of the late Dr. Philip P. Carpenter. This exemplary man, when stationed at Warrington, coming pretty often to my house to the delight of all my children, became deeply attached to the boy: and the tender reverence with which, in after years, he always spoke of him was very touching. From a scruple of their father's, none of Dr. Lant Carpenter's children had been baptised. Philip, not inheriting this scruple, resolved to submit himself to the rite in middle life: and he availed himself of the opportunity to assume the name Herbert as a prefix to that by which he was known; and adopted thenceforth a monogram embodying the initials of the three Christian names. This feeling in an occasional visitor may serve as some measure of the sorrow at home. A memorial stone marks the grave under the trees in the little Park Chapel ground."

The funeral took place on the 1st of April, when parents and children assembled in the study for joint surrender of their treasure, and united prayer; and then the father, his son Russell, and Mr. Alfred Higginson went to the service at Park Chapel, and by the grave. Mr. Philip Carpenter sent a letter, "almost heartbroken," saying that Herbert had been to him "like an angel from Heaven." The stone bears these touching lines: —

"O life, too fair! upon thy brow
We saw the light — where thou art now.
O death, too sad! in thy deep shade
All but our sorrow seem'd to fade:
O Heaven, too rich! not long detain
Thine exiles from the sight again."

We must now go back a little in our narrative. The time had come for a third edition of the "Rationale," which was to appear in Chapman's "Catholic Series." The preface, dated Jan. 27, 1845, says that it is not without hesitation that the author "has consented to re-issue a book, of whose faults he has acquired so profound a sense, and in which few topics are presented in the manner that now seems to him the best." But the alteration in his point of view consisted "not in the reversal, but in the further unfolding and prosecution of its judgments." On one subject, however, he admits, though guardedly, an important change of opinion. In the first edition he had committed himself to the following statement, referring to the German Rationalists: "Should these attempts to reduce the facts of the evangelical history to common events be successful, the Gospel falls: nor is there any intelligible sense in which one, who thinks that the preternatural may be thus banished from the birth and infancy of our faith, can continue to take the name of Christian."[1] In a note on this passage he remarks that the orthodox, in his desire to *exclude* the Unitarian, and the anti-supernaturalist in his anxiety to *include* himself, agree that "being a Christian means, being a disciple of Christ, and a believer of his doctrine: as an Aristotelian meant a disciple of Aristotle, and a Platonist of Plato." On this view he has the following comment: "If indeed the *essential features* of Christianity are to be found in the doctrinal or preceptive parts of the Scripture, it is difficult to deny to anyone who holds the doctrines and

[1] P. 132 *sq.*

venerates the precepts he finds there, the title of Christian; and it is only on the supposition of the religion of Christ being *essentially historical,* that we can make a belief in *the facts* the basis of our definition." [1] In consequence of these passages he received a long and closely reasoned letter from his friend J. Blanco White, in which the latter contended "that no man has a right to deny the name of Christian to another who wishes to be known by that name, as long as it cannot be proved that he assumes it maliciously, and for the purpose of deception. To declare anyone unworthy of the name of Christian because he does not agree with your *belief,* is to fall into the intolerance of the Articled Churches." He then argues at great length that miracles are far too uncertain historically to be made the credentials of a revelation. To this letter a reply was given, without explicit allusion to it, in the preface of the second edition. The author there disclaims the intention of making "any *harsh* declaration," and treats the difference of opinion respecting the supernatural origin of Christianity as not very serious. He points out that "the great antagonist principles of religion, between which it is the duty of good men to take their choice, are ORTHODOXY and RATIONALISM: of which the one makes belief a duty of the Will, and judges men by their creed; the other makes it an involuntary act of the Understanding, and judges them by their character." Nevertheless he defends his exclusion of the German Rationalists by an argument which, *mutatis mutandis,* was equally applicable to himself as a Unitarian. The term *Christianity* was irrevocably associated with the belief in its supernatural origin, so that it was the name of a particular belief, and not of certain moral qualities; and accordingly he would retain the appellations *Christian* and *Deist* to distinguish those who accepted and those who rejected the supernatural

[1] P. 246.

origin of Christianity. He recognises the obloquy attending the latter name; but "the best way to tame the sting of evil terms, which ought to carry no reproach, is for good men to take them up and wear them." He now, in his third edition, though "still far from concurring in all the statements of the letter" looks upon his reply as "imperfect and unsatisfactory"; and, to enable the reader to form his own judgment, he presents a large portion of the letter in an appendix. His change of view cannot be stated more succinctly than in his own words: —

"He was not at that time acquainted with any form of Anti-supernaturalism but one: that which professes to *account for* Christ and Christianity, and to discern the system of second causes to which all the characteristics of the religion and its author may be referred. To this scheme of belief he still thinks it improper to apply the term *Christian.* Those who hold it may entertain opinions *concurrent with the views of Christ;* but perceiving clearly, as they imagine, how he came by them, they regard him, at best, not as the Master of their faith, but as fellow-pupil with them of the same arguments. Whoever sees in Christ, not an original source of truth and goodness, but only a *product* of something else, is destitute of the attitude of mind constituting religious *discipleship;* which implies, not that we have been convinced by the reasoning of an equal, but that we have been subdued by the authority, and possessed by the intuitions of a higher mind. To take something *on trust,* to feel its self-evidence, to bend before its revealer as above ourselves — human indeed as he speaks to our consciousness, divine as he transcends our analysis — appears to be essential to the disciple, and to constitute the difference between scientific agreement and religious faith. This state of mind, however, which recognises what is beyond nature in Christ, and owns a divine and 'supernatural' authority in his religion, may co-exist with doubt, or even disbelief, in the miracles recorded in the Scriptures. Such scepticism may arise in an inquirer's mind without altering in any way his religious classification. Nothing more is implied in it than simply a new estimate of certain historical testimony, a new conception of the manner in which the early Christian literature assumed its present form, without the slightest change of

reverential posture towards the great Object which this medium presents." [1]

In February, 1845, appeared the first number of the "Prospective Review," with its motto, *Respice, Aspice, Prospice.* This Review was the continuation of an older Journal named "The Christian Teacher," which was started, as a monthly, in 1835. In 1838 it became a quarterly, under the editorship of the Rev. J. H. Thom. The first volume of the new series is dated 1839. The editor retained the old name, so as to preserve the continuity of the publication, but he took care to explain that it was intended to indicate simply that the character of the magazine "shall be constructive not destructive, affirmative not negative, nutritive not combative." In 1845 the editorial staff was enlarged by the inclusion of the Revs. J. J. Tayler, Charles Wicksteed, and James Martineau; and the opportunity was embraced of changing the name, which seemed to make presumptuous claims. The work was to be conducted in a catholic spirit and would "restrain by no rigid Orthodoxy the free expression of different forms and tendencies of mind"; but it was understood to be the organ of what was then a new and growing school among the Unitarians. Dr. Martineau gives such a delightful picture of the partnership in editing this journal that it must be here transcribed: —

"Mr. Thom, having his hands most free, was executive editor; but the contents of the successive numbers were blocked out at cabinet councils, held at one of our Liverpool or Manchester houses. We dined and spent the evening together, often remaining till next day. And in the wide landscape of the past that lies before me in this evening of my life, there are few spots picked out by brighter glow than those hours of loving and animated converse. We were different enough, in modes and material of thought, to stimulate each other, yet so congenial as to be drawn nearer by the polarity. To see Mr. Tayler's richly stored, reverent, and delicate mind

[1] The preface.

set free as a child at play, was in itself an object-lesson in wisdom and beauty. Mr. Thom's habitual inner life among high ideals, and consequent quick detection of imposture and inanity in the actual, could find its grave expression, from the pulpit or the platform, in severe rebuke; but, when only friends were present and offenders away, in a vein of picturesque humour, so refreshing that, even if the victim were there, he would feel like a patient under treatment who, with bitter expectations, found himself let off with a pleasant effervescent draught. The other two partners had the delightful privilege of enjoying the feast of soul, bringing to it only a homely contribution of common sense and some knowledge of affairs." [1]

The first number contains Mr. Martineau's brilliant and highly appreciative criticism of "The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D." [2] He speaks of Arnold as "a man whose memory we love with devotion almost unreserved"; but in the advice to which he yielded in the suppression of his doubts the reviewer sees "the mischievous sophistry and dishonest morality current on these matters among divines," and he views "with astonishment and shame" the "unsoundness of his notions of subscription to articles of faith." He presents his argument against laxity in this respect in a passage of cogent reasoning and moral elevation. Among other subjects touched upon there is an interesting defence of Confirmation, when freed from the admixture of "false and pernicious moral ideas." Speaking of Arnold's intense antipathy to both Benthamism and Newmanism he describes these as "the two grand counterfeits forged at the opposite extremes of error, of true moral responsibility and personal duty; the one merging the conscience in self-interest, the other in priestcraft." The following passage, indicating his view of Christ, deserves attention. Arnold objects, he says, "to the mere historical Christ of the Unitarians: instead of a being nearly two thousand years off, he needs to feel himself the disciple of

[1] "A Spiritual Faith," Memorial Preface, p. xix. *sq.*

[2] Reprinted in Miscellanies, and in Essays, Vol. I.

one who is living now, and to whose heavenly spirit his own may draw nigh in trustful devotion. In his view of Christ, there is nothing to which, with very slight modification of language, we should not heartily assent. He is regarded, in Arnold's theology, less as the achiever of Redemption, than as *himself a Revelation* of the Divine nature; it was not as the author of binding precepts, or the teacher of new truths, or the exemplar of a good life, but as the *symbol of God's moral perfections,* that he was most dear and holy to this noble heart."

In the May number of the same Review appeared his essay on "Church and State," [1] which is largely explanatory of the opinions of recent writers on the subject, but concludes with a valuable sketch of his own ideas of the origin and mutual relations of these two social institutions. Before the close of the year (in November) appeared his important essay on "Whewell's Morality," which was succeeded by a second in the following August.[2] These reviews must be noticed in treating of his philosophy.

In July he preached a sermon, much more startling then than it would be now, on "The Bible and the Child." Its object is to protest against the use of the *whole* Bible in religious education, as "no less at variance with the present condition of theological knowledge than mischievous in its social results." He takes "the spirit and the life of Christ" as the standard by which to judge all else; and he finds much in the Old Testament which, however it may have been suited to a barbarous age, is ill adapted to Christian instruction. "The party-cry of the present day," he exclaims, "about scriptural education demands great plainness of speech, and I scruple not to denounce it as a demoralising and corrupting superstition." In relation to

[1] Reprinted in Miscellanies, and in Essays, Vol. II.

[2] Reprinted in Essays, Vol. III. These are also reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological" (2d Series), 1869.

this sermon he received two letters which he thought of sufficient interest to preserve them. Lady Noel Byron told him how, in her schools, she had tried to minimise, if not wholly exclude, the use of the Old Testament in teaching the children, and supersede even the reference to it by a suitable commentary on the New Testament, treating the fulfilment of prophecy as a Jewish prejudice. On the other hand, Miss Emily Taylor remonstrated with him for his plain speaking, urging that the purest and wisest people she had known had been the most devoted to Bible reading, that the Bible *as a whole* is "self-vindicated," and that extracts and selections are recognised by all three parties in England as desirable, but, when made, eviscerate and kill the force and interest of the literature. She pleads that Jesus Christ was himself a Jew, brought up on the Old Testament. To the last plea Mr. Martineau replies: "Yes; and hence it was that he opened his own ministry by contrasting it with the teaching of 'them of old time.'"

These arduous labours were relieved by an occasional holiday; but a holiday at Park Nook was characterised, not by languid rest, but by "energetic idleness." The occupations of one in July in this year consisted of visiting the "Great Britain" in Coburg Dock, sailing in a small boat on the river, and seeing the "beauty monster" come out of the graving dock; gardening, joinering, plumbing, painting; and shifting the otherwise inflexible meal-times to suit the rambles of the long summer day. Another pleasant change was afforded by the visits of friends, not only of relatives, but of others whose associated labours or kindred tastes attracted them to the house. Now it was F. W. Newman, who was "so delightful a companion and so lovable a friend as to enhance rather than spoil" the family intercourse. Now it was George Dawson, who preached in Paradise Street in January, 1846, and was afterwards introduced to a large party invited to meet him at Park

Nook. And again it was Emerson, who on occasion of his second visit, in 1847, left upon Mr. Martineau "an indelible impression of the depth and greatness of his nature," and proved himself "delightful, both as the winning personal friend, and as a lecturer."

One of the most important of Theodore Parker's writings, "A Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion," was published in 1842, but it was not till February, 1846, that Mr. Martineau's criticism of it appeared in the "Prospective Review."[1] In the interval he seems to have had some correspondence with Parker, for he mentions that the latter, writing on March 24, 1845, "takes my plea for gentleness in critical handling of received theological beliefs in the most generous and sympathetic way, remembering what it has cost him to reach his present convictions on these matters." He had also expressed to Dr. Dewey his disapproval of the harsh treatment accorded to Parker by his brother ministers; but Dr. Dewey, in a letter in which he introduced the poet William Cullen Bryant (April 15, 1845), defended their action, speaking of the views of Parker as "blank infidelity," and curiously confounding him with Strauss. Mr. Martineau, who could clearly distinguish intellectual error and moral obtuseness, took a juster view, and his notice is warmly appreciative, though pointing out very plainly the shortcomings of Parker's brilliant work. He begins with a protest against the FEAR which marked the intellectual tendencies of the age, and an earnest plea for sincerity and outspokenness in dealing with religious questions, and this on the ground that faith "has its ultimate seat, not in the mutable judgments of the understanding, but in the native sentiments of Conscience, and the inexhaustible aspirations of Affection! The supreme certainty must needs be too true to be proved: and the highest

[1] Reprinted in Miscellanies, and in Essays, I.

perfection can appear doubtful only to Sensualism and Sin." His rising indignation against the "Doctrine of reserve" and Tractarian Jesuitry finally breaks out in the exclamation, "Honour then to the manly simplicity of Theodore Parker. Perish who may among Scribes and Pharisees, — 'orthodox liars for God,'[1] — *he* at least 'has delivered his soul.'" Still it is said that Parker "is not an exact writer, scarcely a consistent thinker; and his convictions are rather a series of noble fragments, waiting adjustment by maturer toil, than a compact and finished structure." Accordingly the philosophical character of his theism is subjected to an acute examination, which we must pass over for the present. He differs from Parker in not giving so wide a range to inspiration, which he would limit to the sphere of involuntary "consciousness of moral distinctions, and reverence for moral excellence and beauty. Whatever gifts are found in this province of the soul, which are not the produce of human will; which have been neither learned nor earned; which, without the touch of any voluntary process, appear in mysterious spontaneity; are strictly the Inspiration of God." He also looks "with strong repugnance" on the attempt "to render Christianity independent of the individuality of Christ." He can "find no rest in any view of Revelation short of that which pervades the Fourth Gospel, and which is everywhere implicated in the folds of the Logos-doctrine; that it is *an appearance, to beings who have something of a divine spirit within them, of a yet diviner without them, leading them to the Divinest of all, that embraces them both*"; and he regards the evidence of these higher communications as lying within the consciousness of the soul itself, and not in any physical demonstration.

[1] We may compare the words used about the same time by F. W. Robertson, of religious agitators and religious papers: "They tell lies in the name of God; others tell them in the name of the devil: that is the only difference." "Life and Letters," Vol. I. p. 108.

The following letter relating to Parker's work may be inserted here: —

LIVERPOOL, Oct. 3, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR, — I cannot pay in kind my thanks for the great things you have sent me; but such as I have give I thee. The volume [1] will teach you nothing, except what I am myself at heart, and that is not a lesson worth learning. I was pleased to hear that the notice in the Westminster was at all satisfactory to your friends. It did you no justice, having been written under great pressure, and after another article in which you were more fully discussed; besides, — the idea of packing you and Strauss into one paper! as well put the Mississippi and the Nile into a quart bottle. I find traces everywhere of the widening influence of your book, which penetrates into strange quarters and breaks through the most rigorous cordon of sect. Your promised "Quarterly" excites much expectation among us. May it last longer than the "Dial," and be a little more accessible to plebeian apprehension like mine.

With our kindest remembrances and hearty good wishes,

Yours right truly,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

The article in the "Westminster Review," referred to in the foregoing letter, appeared in April, 1847. It was a review of Strauss's "Life of Jesus" and of Parker's "Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion." After pointing out the strong contrast between the two writers, he traces historically the change from the Puritan reliance on documents to the critical view of the Scriptures. In regard to the Fourth Gospel, he says: "Though Bretschneider, pursuing the usual Teutonic method of exhaustion, has certainly overstated his case against the Gospel of John, it does not seem likely that any strong confidence in the authenticity of that book will ever be recovered." A large part of the article is devoted to an examination of Strauss's hypothesis. While admitting that it may have a limited application, Mr. Martineau thinks it enormously exaggerated, and believes

[1] Presumably the second volume of "Endeavours."

that the Gospels have a substantial historical basis. He concludes with an analysis of Parker's work, accompanied by some critical remarks.

In November appeared his review of Morell's "History of Modern Philosophy," which is reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," second series, 1869.

On the 31st of January, 1847, he preached a sermon on "Ireland and her Famine," [1] whose sympathetic and eloquent pleading might still send a thrill of gladness through every Irish heart. While tracing the misery of Ireland chiefly to the transference thither of a method of government for which the people were ill prepared, he recognises as a more conspicuous cause of its permanent social condition "the criminal neglect of their obligations by the proprietors of the soil." He lays it down as "a principle of natural justice, and of English constitutional usage, that there can be no absolute private property in land; that the State simply administers its possessions by the hands of private individuals, conceding to them privileges of use, alienation and bequest on condition of certain services rendered back; — establishing them in specified rights over it, as against others, but never as against itself." "Of all these conditions the very first in order undoubtedly is, that the land *shall support its people;* that the cultivator shall live, before the owner may gather; that no rent can be touched, till labour has been fed; seeing that the spade and the plough give an earlier and more indefeasible title than the parchment-roll." He then shows in most pathetic pictures how "these primary conditions have been overlooked and violated"; and further points out how "the cultivator dares not save," for "the slightest improvement in his negligent and wasteful culture will bring down a fresh claim upon him; and he is safe only on the verge of pauperism,

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

and with a farm that quiets the suspicions of cupidity by its very look of beggary. And this, it must be remembered, takes place in a country where the occupancy of land is identical with the holding of existence itself." Can you wonder, he asks, that the ejecting landlord "is regarded, in the passion of despair, as himself beginning the game of life against life, and provoking the guilty retaliation"? At that time the miseries of Ireland touched the hearts of the hearers, and the collection amounted to £505.

The great personal interest of the present year was the prospect of a new and beautiful church, to be erected on a more eligible site. The rapid growth of Liverpool, removing the residences of the inhabitants further and further from the neighbourhood of the Exchange, had long rendered Paradise Street Chapel inconvenient to its congregation; and it was resolved to remove to Hope Street. By the beginning of June the plans of Barry and Brown for the new church were unanimously accepted, to Mr. Martineau's great satisfaction; and his mind was already contemplating what Mrs. Martineau calls "a great and wondrous scheme," which was still a profound secret, except from a few official friends. This mysterious design was to spend a year in Germany during the building of the church. His first wish was that the two congregations of Paradise Street and Renshaw Street should unite for two years, and allow each minister a year's absence, while one remained at home to discharge the duties of both. This plan, however, was not carried into effect.[1]

He spent his vacation at Grange, in Borrowdale, and, while there, decided to select from a portmanteau of manuscripts a second volume of "Endeavours." This, as well as his second edition of the first volume, was given to the public before the end of the year. It was dedicated to his

[1] Referred to in a letter to Mr. Thom, July 10, 1847.

friend, Mr. Thom, and, like its predecessor, was a miscellaneous collection. The hoped-for sermons on the Ministry of Christ and the Pauline Gospel were postponed, owing to a growing sense of the inadequacy of his materials. In the preface he gives a glimpse into the process of his thought. He points out that differences of theological belief have their secret foundation in different philosophies of religion; that the sacred writings are allowed to retain precisely the residue of authority which, according to the believer's view of our nature and our life, is unsupplied from any other source; and that therefore the psychology of religion must have precedence of its documentary criticism. Hence he says: "I am not ashamed to confess, that extensive and, in the end, systematic changes in the opinions I derived from sect and education have had no higher origin than self-examination and reflection, — a more careful interrogation of that internal experience, of which the superficial interpretation is so seductive to indolence and so prolific in error." In the preface he also gives expression to a view which may explain some of the characteristics of his preaching. "Preaching," he says, "is essentially a lyric expression of the soul, an utterance of meditation in sorrow, hope, love, and joy, from a representative of the human heart in its divine relations." Hence he condemns extemporaneous preaching, which "is as little likely to produce a genuine Sermon, as the practice of improvising to produce a great poem. The thoughts and aspirations which look direct to God, and the kindling of which among a fraternity of men constitutes social worship, are natives of solitude: the spectacle of an assembly is a hindrance to their occurrence; and though, where they have been devoutly set down beforehand, they may be re-assumed under such obstacle, they would not spontaneously rise till the presence of a multitude was forgotten, and by a rare effort of abstraction the loneliness of the spirit was re-

stored." This certainly does not describe a universal experience. There are those who feel their intensest spiritual glow before the combined fires of many hearts, and they are the most moving preachers who, instead of feeling their hearers to be a hindrance, have their passionate sympathy called forth by the presence of an assembly whose struggling emotions they would lift into a diviner life. He once alluded to this subject in a College debate, and made it apparent that he was keenly sensitive to any symptom of indifference or scepticism in his hearers, so that he felt himself deadened by a lower atmosphere than that which his own lofty spirit was accustomed to breathe. This loneliness of nature may explain how it was that, while his preaching fascinated those who came with souls akin to his, and thirsting for his high spiritual thought, it was sometimes found to be less kindling than that of men who were otherwise of far inferior powers.

It is less surprising that he required solitude for the composition of his sermons. This was not due to any inability to concentrate his attention. To write at all, he had to write alone; else he could not hope to "be in the spirit on the Lord's day." [1]

The following abstract from F. W. Newman's strictures on the "Endeavours," together with a letter of Mr. Martineau's in reply, and his later comments, will be read with interest: [2] —

ABSTRACT OF LETTER FROM F. W. NEWMAN, OCTOBER, 1847.

"Written under the first impression of the recently published 'Endeavours,' half-read with eager sympathy in two days, though not with entire approval of the 'lyrical' conception which I have of a sermon, and which he thinks ap-

[1] From a letter of Mrs. Martineau's, Nov. 23, 1845.

[2] The abstract, with comments appended, was made in the later years of his life, but bears no exact date.

proaches more nearly to the *Catholic* idea, as exemplified in Chrysostom, Massillon, Fénélon, and partially reflected in Jeremy Taylor, than to the *Reformed,* who appealed to the understanding in the construction of doctrine, — Luther, Latimer, Owen, Knox. It was in the Hymns of the Puritans and their allies that the *affections* found their expression; 'our evangelists go round like a squirrel in a cage, and, however actively they step, rise not an inch higher.' Deep as my appeal often cuts into the conscience, he finds a fanatical element in some of its most touching applications of Christ's own teachings, especially in the case of the rich young man whom he sent away sorrowing, — a case which he analyses with a curious rationalistic literalness. Surely the only way to meet the settled sorrow of a life below the level of its own sacred ideal, is to startle it by the plenary demand of its utmost surrender, and force it into self-knowledge by raising the divine claim to its supreme pitch: 'Yes, it has kept the commandments'; but is it with the tacit understanding that they shall not ask more than is comfortable? 'Will it stand the test of *unconditional surrender?* or must you have *easy terms* for your work in the service of God and your brother man?' It is intelligible enough that the young man went away 'very sorrowful' from this appeal; and equally so that the disciples put their own coarse construction upon it, and found in it a ground of self-gratulation on their superiority. F. W. Newman's view is founded on an acceptance of the Gospel narrative as authentic reports of eye and ear witnesses, unmodified by the media of transmission, whereas it is certain that they are an assemblage of popular traditions, imbued throughout with the preoccupying Messianic ideas and contemporary beliefs of the personal attendants of Jesus, and their disciples in the apostolic and post-apostolic age. Till these are allowed for, the true personality of Jesus cannot be seen. It will come out clear and majestic after adequate critical sifting of the mixed materials furnished by the Evangelists; but these materials, taken as a whole, as if historical, yield only a confused multitude of superimposed and blurred images, with incompatible predicates, which can be construed into no conceivable figure, either human or divine."

MARTINEAU TO NEWMAN.

LIVERPOOL, Nov. 2, 1847.

MY DEAR NEWMAN, — . . . If my recent volume speaks any truth to you, I shall try to quiet the misgivings which now and then visit me respecting it. I know it indeed to be true to

my own mind; but there seems a peculiar presumption in a man's putting forth his personal confessions, as if *they* could have value for the world. If one has *knowledge* to communicate, or new combinations of reasoning to present, these may be fairly estimated beforehand by the possessor; but the contents of the moral and spiritual life cannot be judged by like standards of comparison, and must be thrown out to take their chance among the sympathies of other minds. When they meet with a real welcome there, it relieves an inevitable fear lest the urgency with which they pressed for utterance should have been a mere delusion.

Your remark about the High Church preaching in comparison with that of the Reformers is so manifestly correct that it staggered me a good deal at first. And it certainly shows that my antithesis was not well chosen for the purposes of illustration. Perhaps, however, the historical fact, when referred to its proper causes, is not so much against me as it appears. The events of the seventeenth century occasioned a kind of *crossing* of influences, I think, so far as this particular matter is concerned. The Evangelical system, with its new reliance on the Scriptures, its great doctrine of Justification by Faith, and the necessity under which it lay of shaping its subjective and enthusiastic religion into a structure competing in distinctness with the external Christianity of the old Church, was indeed driven to methods of *Argument;* the Intellect had to create at a stroke a Theology to rival the compacted formation of centuries. It was a game of life or death for the new enthusiasm, which must either bring over the Reason to its side, or else die out itself. Was there not, therefore, a temporary coalescence of the "lyrical" spirit with argumentative forms, enabling the Puritans — so long as this concurrence lasted — to satisfy the devout wants of their people with extemporaneous address? And had not the *use of the book* by High Church Divines something to do with the obligation on all Conformists to read the "Book of Homilies" published by Authority? Was not the habit a remnant of this outward mark of submission? The practice of written composition once established would itself determine such minds as Taylor's to a deeply religious style of preaching. The French examples — as Massillon — are as far as possible from my notion of what preaching ought to be; — full of Rhetoric, without a tone of Poetry. Looking beyond our own country, we surely find that the Roman Catholic Church employs extempore preachers; while the Reformed Churches, in proportion as their religious life has detached

itself from the procedure of systematic divinity, have resorted more and more to written composition, though disguised under a *memoriter* delivery. — I confess, however, that you may well condemn an illustration which stands in need of all this questionable exposition to save some remnant of its credit.

Your remark as to the character of my Christian theology — that it is not a permanent structure, but a bridge to aid the timid — affects me with a certain sadness, which is perhaps an augury of its truth. And I am too well aware of the severe cost of parting with an object of deep trust and reverence not to be awake to the temptations from this source which may endanger one's perfect fidelity. Yet I cannot but think your view of Christ as a spiritual guide more severe than the highest standard compatible with the conditions of historical existence would require. I do not attempt to explain away any of the erroneous promises and precepts which you enumerate (with the exception of the proposal to build the temple in three days, which appears to me to have a very noble symbolical meaning). I have long been convinced that these expectations held out to the first disciples must be taken literally; and, if truly reported (which we have no right, perhaps, to question), must be dealt with as mistakes. They do not, however, strike me as very material in the estimate of Christ's character. I grant you that, if such claims and promises were to be put forth by anyone in Europe now, they would prove him to be too much tinctured with fanaticism to be safely followed. But under the conditions of society in Palestine, with a universal prevalence of theocratical ideas and Messianic anticipations, drawing into their vortex the whole religious genius of the nation, the case is surely very different. The mistake, in the one case, would be the special assumption, or rather *creation,* of an exceptional fanaticism; in the other, it was simply a failure to escape from an all-pervading delusion. I do not see how any degree of sanctity of mind could have afforded security against such a speculative error. The moment it came in contact with the practical life of Jesus, and invited him to set in action the coarse conventional methods for erecting the Messiah's Kingdom, he shrunk, with infallible moral feeling, from the touch of such things, and after a temporary retirement, resumed his spiritual course; and so his will evaded what his understanding could not discard. That, with the expectations he held, he should esteem it the duty of himself and those who sympathised with him to resign everything in order to proclaim the "Kingdom," appears to me no dero-

gation from his moral perfection. In fact, to a people possessed with these ideas, it would *really become a duty* to take this very course; nor would any career short of this be up to the *mark of conscience,* with such a one as the rich young man. Perhaps, too, it makes a little difference if the summons was given, not to follow him as the Messiah, but to join him in proclaiming the approach of the Messiah; and it seems from the three first Gospels very doubtful whether Jesus really identified himself with the Messiah at all. No doubt there are passages which imply that *he did;* but so are there which affirm his circumstantial fore-announcement of his death. On the strength of other and counter indications I do not hesitate to believe that both these statements are retrospective interpretations and imaginations of the disciples, anxious to find in his mind beforehand all that they discerned in his life afterwards.

You will perhaps tell me that my large concessions leave little that is worth defending. I do not, however, feel it to be so; and with all its imperfections, I find nothing still, in history or nature, so divine as that old Gospel. Jesus appears to me the highest of *realities.* It is easy, in mere imagination now, to improve upon that reality, by withdrawing the intellectual limitations and reproducing the conception he has left us in the latitude and under the conditions of modern thought. But every departure from him as the essential Type of spiritual perfection seems to me a declension to something lower. I am far, however, from supposing that the rejection of this standard by others implies contentment with an inferior one. It doubtless arises in good minds from the clear discernment of something beyond it, — something hid from me at present, I confess, but which, whenever revealed, I would humbly welcome, not only without fear of profaneness, but with joyful trust in God's good light.

. . . . . .

Ever my dear Newman, yours affectionately,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

ABSTRACT OF LETTER FROM NEWMAN, NOVEMBER 15, WITH COMMENTS.

" The question which he has raised is not whether Jesus was a good and great man, but whether he is the *perfect image of God,* — a claim which is forfeited by the slightest imperfection or failing, short of *absolute wisdom.* Missing this, he is not a safe guide for man. No finite being can be the visible

image of the invisible God; it is a mischievous idolatry to hold him up as a model for religious contemplation; the orthodox theory rightly, for this purpose, insists on the necessity of superhuman origin. Without this, how can I call myself his δοῦλος and him my σωτήρ? If Jesus did not claim to be the Messiah, it is impossible to say what is historical in the Gospels, and he becomes a visionary character.

"December 5. A long and very interesting critique of my discipleship to Jesus of Nazareth as realising and revealing the true spiritual relation between man and God, and therefore, in this filial relation, the whole moral life of man. His reasoning would be effective if we assumed the pagan (*e. g.,* Aristotelian) view of 'virtue,' as ἀρετὴ, — *i. e., any good quality,* though given as an *inbred instinct,* like *courage;* he speaks of it in this sense, applying it, for instance, to the *simplicity* of a child and to *maternal affection* for an infant. If these are virtues, all animals come under the *moral* category along with man. The whole question at issue between us first comes up, for me, when the ἀρετὴ, instead of being this φυσικὴ, becomes προαιρετικὴ *through voluntary rejection of a rival;* — this is the birth of *conscience* and the beginning of *character.* On this distinction the whole history of the Will, of the influence of example, of the inward life of the soul rests for its interpretation. Until this is recognised, a man may be a fine handsome creature, but he has no duty or responsibility; no *moral* character; no personal intercommunion with a living and inspiring Mind supreme in himself. What precisely is *needed* in a *model,* in order to bring home to the soul the reality and meaning of this relation, and open to us this *life in God,* I do not profess to define; I only say that it is present in the unassailable features of the Gospel of Christ, and is in no way contradicted or excluded by the human limits of his knowledge and inheritance of misconceptions characteristic of his nation and his time. I quite admit, however, the serious difficulty of saving and separating the historical truth and essence which form the nucleus of such mixed products as the Gospels. But I am convinced that it may be done by patient application of the resources of modern historical criticism. But if F. W. N., when all is done, prefers Fletcher of Madeley and his own conscience, he has doubtless goodness enough to ensure him peace from God and man."

The sermons on the Christianity of Paul, alluded to in the preface to each volume of the "Endeavours," were

never printed; and as they are still extant in manuscript, it may be allowable in a biography to give some account of this interesting series. There are ten sermons, which were delivered on consecutive Sundays, with one omission, from January 31 to April 11, 1841. They were redelivered in Little Portland Street Chapel, London, in the spring of 1863, and three of them were repeated, on separate occasions, on Feb. 7, 1869, Jan. 9, 1870, and Oct. 8, 1871. Three of them are marked as altered, and one, on the "Doctrine of Human Nature," is almost rewritten. Our extracts are made from the revised copies.

The first sermon is entitled "Saul the Pharisee," and gives an account of the early life of Saul and of the influences which helped to form his mind and prepare him for his Apostolic calling. He is placed in contrast with Peter, whose "whole mind was of Judaical construction, having the narrowness, the force, the dogmatism and piety of his nation." Had the cause of our religion been left to Peter "with the remainder of the twelve, it would never have burst the bounds of the synagogue, but have perished among the Jewish sects." It was Paul "who made the posthumous discovery of the all-comprehensive spirit and sublime relations of the events that had passed in Palestine; who disentangled the Divine and pure elements of the new faith from the Hebrew admixture that would else have overwhelmed it; who by force of thought combined them into a whole, and by force of purpose published them from land to land as a universal religion. . . . God had given Syria to the Twelve, but the world to Paul." This fact ought to guard us against a disposition sometimes manifested to prefer the historical books of the New Testament to the literary. The Gospels are not the true fountains of Christian theology, but, with the exception of the last, exhibit the exclusive and Judaical version of the history; the writings of Paul display the wide and human interpretation. Paul's foreign birth must have largely tempered his nationality with Greek ideas. He was brought up to the local occupation of a tent-maker; and "the traffic could not but bring the young Hebrew into contact with travelled men, and give him a wider view of the world than could be had from Jerusalem; with the hardy nomad chief, whose free and simple bearing

seemed to bring a snowy breath of Taurus into the city heats; with the trader of the Levant, at home anywhere within the Mediterranean circuit, and able to tell of the gaiety of Corinth, the riches of Egypt, and the majesty of Rome; with the cultivator of the Plain of Issus, who could yet bring for the curious antiquarian a Macedonian corselet or a clasp of Persian gold, turned up by the plough on the field of the great Alexander's victory. Nor would the city itself permit such a one as Paul to remain the mere narrow-minded Jew. Did he ask the meaning of the altar on the river bank? It was a memorial of the Macedonian conqueror's gratitude, who had there plunged into the cold waters of the Cydnus and had been spared from the fever incurred by so rash an act. Did he look in at the trophies which crowded the open temple of Neptune? They proclaimed the severities and triumphs of Pompey, who had swept the pirates from the seas, and made the tracts of the Levant feel the vigilance of Roman law. Did he pause to read the vainglorious inscription in the Forum so often ridiculed by the chieftains that came in from the hills? It was the self-praise of the unmilitary Cicero, recording some petty discomfiture administered by the Proconsul to the pastoral tribes of the upland country. Nor had Tarsus declined into any state unworthy of such considerable recollections. Built by the most effeminate of Persian princes, it had become one of the most vigorous centres of Grecian culture. Placed almost at the angle between the Hellenic and purely Oriental tribes, on one of the great highroads by land and sea from Europe to the East, the motley population of its harbours and streets could be rivalled by Alexandria alone. Nowhere but in the Egyptian capital and in Athens could temples so numerous and graceful, libraries and museums so rich, and schools so distinguished, be found." But while the outward and perceptive nature of Saul opened itself to the genial influence of a Pagan civilisation, intellectually and at heart there never was a truer disciple of the severe and sublime monotheism of his people. "The ardent and generous soul of Saul could never have found rest among the Sadducees, who in their day were much what the Unitarians are reputed by enemies to be in ours; cold, aristocratic, few, believing as little as they could, but practising fairly their small profession." As little would he feel attracted by the "mechanical asceticism and meditative piety of the Essenes." "Saul, needing a scope and enterprise of soul afforded by neither of these two, found in the Pharisaic system the means of fusing together the energies of them both."

The Pharisaic scheme, however, could not burst open the law to a width that would suffice for Paul. "He struggled and heaved ineffectually beneath the repression of bald precept, which did but remind him of the burning passions of his nature; but if permitted to pursue and love the ideal of his faith and conscience, would feel no temptation, and be more than conqueror through him that loved him. Restive and unhappy beneath a law that watched him, he would become glorious and faithful under an affection that transcended him."

The second sermon is on "Paul the Convert." Providence postponed his call till Jesus had passed from Palestine to Heaven. "With his restless energy and versatility of action, and his bold range and force of thought, he could never have attached himself to the domestic prophet of Galilee, content to pass from village to village with healing mercy of word and deed, to see the most glorious power and divinest wisdom restrained to the labourer of the beach and field, and let the Prince of God's decrees sink into the shades of deepest humiliation. . . . He could never resign himself to that passiveness of veneration by which others clung to the person of Jesus, or feel the almost feminine affection which entered into the allegiance of John." If ever he had heard Christ "teaching in the Temple courts with words of grace and truth, or shrunk for a moment from his rebuke of Pharisees and hypocrites, or seen him when he rode over scattered flowers through the street, with sad abstracted look amid the general acclaim, till the flash of prophecy kindled behind his tears, we can imagine that the young zealot turned away with a light step, and told the tale with a contemptuous lip." He was exasperated by the success "of these importunate Galileans, for ever intruding their rude exhortations, and always ending with the same fanatical tale about their provincial prophet. . . . And in proportion as he had burned to give a greater expansion to the Law . . . was his mortification at the attempt to contract it into a mere Galileanism, of origin so obscure, and character so illiterate, and of hero so shameful in his fate." Hence he was led to separate himself from the time-serving counsels of Gamaliel and become the envoy of the unbelieving Sadducees. His fury turned the tide of public favour, and "in the Sanhedrin alone was there any lukewarm reception of all this zeal. But there, too, was the triumph of the young Pharisee destined to be complete. A foreign convert, who had evidently taken the new faith to heart from the glimpses he caught of its universal character, had been made trustee of the Christians' com-

mon fund; and not content with this office, he taught with impassioned speech in the synagogue till light from the soul came out upon his features, and made them like those of an angel. Catching, as by prophecy, the spirit undiscerned as yet of the religion he proclaimed, he let fall portentous words about the law of temple-worship, and the exchange of Law for love; and as the inspiration of one faith is the blasphemy of another, he was arraigned and hurried before the Sanhedrin to give in his answer to the charge. Scarcely had he begun, before Saul and his witnesses had the satisfaction to perceive that the case was one to confirm the policy they had pursued, and give them a verdict even in that lenient assembly. Stephen, strange to the audience and excitable in himself, gave no heed to the particulars of the charge; assumed the tone, not of defence, but of exhortation, warming into eager expostulation, and bursting at length into vehement rebuke, the exasperation of which no judicial assembly could endure; the persecutor saw it work; the Gamaliel Pharisees became restless and excited; they murmured and shook their heads; they looked in angry sympathy at each other; the more irritated started from their seats, and were hardly drawn down again. They stopped their ears; they gnashed their teeth; and rose at length as one man, and rushing from the place, swept the prisoner before them to the street, nor ever paused till they had passed the city gate to the place of tumultuary death; and, scarcely waiting till the witnesses had cast the first stone, hurled their brutal shower on the martyr's uplifted head, crushing forth thereby only a mild forgiveness to themselves, and a happy soul to the embrace of Christ." But now that all resistance from without was withdrawn, he began to encounter some obstruction from within. "It was impossible that to a mind so quick and powerful and a moral sense so healthy and sincere, images and memories, gathered from the scenes he had witnessed, should not recur in the pauses of reflection, to sicken his heart with doubt, — recur at first in momentary snatches, gone with a single pulse of thought, but soon with longer gaze at him and more frequent expostulation, till they crowded on him with a torture which forced reflection to see what they were worth. He had been from house to house among these people, and overheard their domestic converse and their social prayer; and though the storm within him drowned all impressions then, whispers began to reach him now from the blessed spectacles to which he had won such fierce admission; sweet home tones of love and duty he had caught; low and mel-

lowed voices of inspired devotion, as if confiding all to a God close by; gleams, too, of faces that returned his fiery glance with a gaze most clear and deep, like starlight upon flame; of silent embraces, followed by a few farewell words of immortal hope, when he tore away the members of families from each other; of constancy, even in women, so quiet as well as resolute, that no prompting but of Heaven could sustain its serenity. . . . That image of Stephen's last attitude and look, the speaking enthusiasm of his upturned features conversing with an apparition viewless to flesh and blood, the burst of invocation that told what the vision was, the sublime prayer with which the martyr collapsed and fell, — a prayer of which Saul must have felt himself to be the chief object, — could not but haunt a man whose imagination was no despiser of visions, and whose heart was alive to the grandeur of faith." Reflection on these things drove him at first to increased violence; but, as Damascus came in sight, the prospect "agitated the soul of Saul with a tumult of dreadful thoughts. Was he then to be the messenger, to that fair and glorious city, of death that might be murder, and murder that might shed the blood of saints? Was he perhaps to find his victims among the very friends whom he intended to visit? Was he to have the sight of another Stephen, gifted with enraptured visions in his fall?" What was the outward event we cannot tell. If his own hints content us, we must say "that the vision was personal, lonely, and unshared, a revelation of the Son of God within him; a consciousness of communion opened with one whom he had vainly tried to persecute, and was henceforth to serve." The new faith, as exhibited by the believers at Damascus, "had too much of Judaic exclusiveness, and made too little use of its glorious elements of spiritual power, to fill the aspirations of the new disciple"; and so he withdrew into Arabia, probably to Petra, and there he "wrought out that sublime revolution which converted him into the Apostle of all nations."

The third sermon, on "Paul's Messiah," contrasts his view with that of the original Apostles. Theirs was largely founded on personal attachment to their Lord, which blended a softening element of friendship with their faith, and made it a development from their affections rather than their understanding. It transformed their tastes, spiritualised their conscience, and exalted their reason; "but if it preserved the love, it preserved also the prejudices of their first discipleship." Their thoughts still ran on the temporal sway of the Messiah, which was only postponed till his return; and they admitted to the

promised glory only the children of Abraham, and the few who would adopt the Mosaic yoke. Paul yearned for something more comprehensive than this gospel of the synagogue. "Jesus was to him not a *Galilean peasant,* but a *heavenly ideal.* He had not known him, unless in aversion, during his earthly and local ministry, when he had on him the traces of national birth, and legal obligations, and a limited mission; but only as an immortal, escaped from the relations of lineage and clime, and resident in that world where law and temple are not found." To a modern Christian, whose whole faith is historical, the most remarkable feature in the Apostle's theory of the Messiah is "its *entire prospectiveness.*" The events that had taken place were but "the successive preludes to the real advent, and our Apostle stands in the attitude not of one watching the receding steps of divine events, and seeking to preserve their vestiges, but of one vigilant for some sacred glory about to be revealed." Of such small account did he consider the recent ministry in Palestine "that he never informed himself of its contents; he asked no questions of the Apostles who had witnessed it, intimated no sorrow that he had not shared their privileges, and repeatedly affirmed that they had enjoyed not the least advantage over him." Jesus "is presented everywhere, not as a person, but as an idea; as the invisible realisation of a great Providential scheme, in which the *forms* of his existence rather than its spirit, his lineage, his death, his ascension, rather than his mind, are the essentials"; and this arose from the confident expectation of his return. The sermon then shows at length how this characteristic pervades the Apostle's writing. The fact that he thus began from the heavenly, the other Apostles from the earthly sphere, determines the different compass of their theology. "Reasoning backwards from that celestial figure, he found a function which escaped the rest, for the earthly ministry of Christ; and in his cross especially, over which the others hastily stepped to reach the resurrection, he saw a primary significance that made it the very crisis of history; and in his person a compendium of our double nature, lifted through struggling elements into divine simplicity at last; and in his glorified lot, a discharge of all the limits of lineage and law, in favour of a purely spiritual City of God."

The next two sermons are on "Paul the Missionary," and are so largely biographical that they need not be followed in detail. Mr. Martineau thinks that Paul's views were more slowly developed than they naturally appeared to himself to

be, when he looked back upon their formation in his advanced years. He accepts the supposition that the Apostle escaped Nero's persecution, and was spared to visit Crete and even Spain, and he says, "it is not till the thirty-second year from his conversion that he is thought, on the doubtful authority of traditions preserved by Dionysius of Corinth and Jerome, to have been thrown, with Peter, into the imprisonment so affectingly mentioned in the second letter to Timothy, — an imprisonment from which he was delivered, as a Roman citizen, by the sword of the executioner, and his campanion, as a Galilean, by the ignominious but now consecrated cross." He believes that the work which Paul had done at Ephesus fell to the charge of John, who, he says, "when Mary's time was over, spent his age within this place, and, I fear we must say, brought a Judaic reaction on this greatest of the apocalyptic churches, and wiped out the very name of Paul, to wait the appreciation of a calmer and more catholic age."

An eloquent description, of which a portion may be quoted, is given of the difficulties which had to be encountered in spreading Christianity throughout the Roman empire: "No modern imagination can adequately represent to itself the difficulties which Christianity encountered and vanquished in its struggle with ancient Paganism. We naturally compare the enterprise with the missionary labours of our own times; and seeing that the united zeal of Christendom, with all the wealth of the established hierarchies, and the energy of its awakened people, scarcely produces in centuries any impression on the domains of foreign superstition, we are struck with wonder at the prowess of that solitary Apostle who, in half a life, shook the fabric of polytheism from its foundation. We think, too, of the geographical diffusion of the Gospel, and looking at its unnoticed infancy, in the hamlets of the meanest province and most abject population of the world, are astonished to find it, ere one generation has passed away, in living operation from the Euphrates to the Rhone. Yet in this we see only the smallest part of the conquest effected by our religion. . . . By simply being Christians, we are disqualified for apprehending the great work that has made us so; and, with a holy modesty, our faith silently educates us into a state of mind which conceals from us the wonders of her earthly achievements. We think of religion as essentially spiritual and universal, involving relations common to every class and clime, between God and the spirit of man. . . . But to this whole system of thought the nations of the old world were utter strangers. With them

religion was no disembodied spirit, dwelling above the relations of time and place, or penetrating them all; it was no abstract truth, belonging to any mind that could apprehend it, but an ingredient of national tradition, the unwritten lore of a sacred antiquity, the mystic cloud of glory out of which the actual heroes and sages, parents of a people's pride and greatness, came in perspective forth with shapes more and more definite and human. It was an integral and indissoluble part of the very existence of each tribe, and even the physical aspect of each country, forming the essence of every local legend, and having tales to tell of every tangled glen, or hollow shore, or hidden cave, or mountain's fantastic form, the acknowledged source of law, of polity, and letters; the ally of liberty, and the creator of art. It was no matter of *opinion*, but of *inheritance*. . . . To ask the Greek to renounce his religion was to ask him to disown his parentage, to expatriate himself, to become a man without a history, to strip his country naked to its geology, and to blot out the poetry of his life. And if you could even effect so vast a revolution in his modes of thought as to persuade him that it was his duty thus to lay down all the accidents of his nature, and stand up, a man alone with God, the practical difficulties of executing this conviction were great beyond description. . . . And when we remember that all this system of social life was to be penetrated and evangelised by men nurtured in culture every way lower, exhibiting a form of mind in itself wholly unfit to conciliate the respect and compete with the acuteness of Heathenism; when we compare the narrow world of thought in which they had lived with the various life, the vast scale, the refined influences of Greek or Roman society; when we consider that their position, as missionaries among tribes of vastly superior civilisation, was not less anomalous than that of a Chinese sent over to turn Great Britain to Confucius, we shall appreciate the inherent force of that religion by which the wisdom of God overcame the foolishness of men."

The following passage will indicate Mr. Martineau's high appreciation of the Apostle, while frankly recognising what was transient in the form of the Pauline Gospel: "In this temper, with this high courage, did he go round the open countries of the world; with mind amid the churches below, and spirit with Christ above; looking down from that station on the breathing earth and the fellowship of men with an eye of divine pity, yet mingling in the meanest scene with a heart of human sympathy. At the end of twenty years of peril and

toil, the force of God within him was not crushed out by the violence and pressure of the hostile world; and though the tone of his writings is more quiet and even sad, the vigour of his hand is unrelaxed. . . . Conquerors of empire seldom leave trophies so wide and durable as his; *they* may multiply temples, *he* built up a faith; they may found cities, he bequeathed the civilisation to fill and ennoble them. From Damascus to the rock of Gibraltar, he left a chain of churches, spanning the length of the Mediterranean, to testify to his energy and faith; to grow amid the decay of Europe; to rise with freshened power from the shock of nations and the extinction of ancient culture; to nurse the noble tribe of hardy Germans into glorious life, and bring together the mighty concourse that in a hundred lands worship God in Christ this day."

Four sermons follow, containing an exposition of Paul's doctrine of Human Nature, of the Cross, of the Divine Government, of the Church and the Sacraments. His mature view of much of Paul's teaching is contained in "The Seat of Authority," and here a condensed abstract must suffice. Having vindicated the freedom of the will,[1] Mr. Martineau observes that Paul "has become the source of all the modern forms of the predestinarian doctrine"; but the ascription of this view to him has "very little foundation." For he sought to adjust the relations of the completed history of Christ to the great classes into which his faith divided mankind, and to detect the mighty Rule that extended from the beginning to the end. That his view of responsibility is not different from Christ's is apparent when he touches on the personal obligations of individuals rather than the historical functions of classes, the providential results of collective agency being often quite different from anything consciously contemplated by the agents. According to Paul's teaching, the knowledge of God is inherent in the natural mind; and more primitive than the recognition of the Deity without is the consciousness of something holier than human judgment moving within, so that all know that they *ought* to love God and serve his will. But below the serene heights of thought "lies a fouler region turbid with doubts and self, and charged with earthly passion"; and hence man experiences "a wild and preternatural struggle of temptation." Nevertheless it is in the higher in-

[1] This sermon is marked as "almost rewritten," and accordingly the special teaching may belong to the year 1871. The part dealing with the will is prefixed to the original sermon.

gredient that Paul finds the genuine and properly characteristic constituent of human nature. "That which the Gospel assumes then to be defective in human nature is not the want of *holy knowledge,* but the want of *holy will.*" The causes of this strife are found not simply in personal unfaithfulness, but in a defect of power inherent in the very *material* of which man is moulded. "The carnal element of our nature carries in it the inherent taint of 'sin,' — a turbid colouring of *original evil,* prior to any positive and conscious *transgression.*" The opposite of this is Spirit, which carries all the affirmative powers which our carnal infirmity excludes. "To metamorphose man from flesh into spirit, not by ethical conviction, but by supernatural reconstitution, was, in the Apostle's view, the whole end of the Gospel economy." There is a secret sadness, unknown to innocence, at every heart; and accordingly union with God must proceed from the good pleasure of God, not from the qualifications of man. Law and precept only make matters worse, having no productive force. "Wisely then did God take occasion from the sinlessness of Christ . . . to *offer him* to human faith and affection, rather than fresh injunctions to the human conscience; wisely did he read the hearts of his children when he resolved to try love instead of law. . . . He that can be taken out of himself, and forget not only his worthless cares but his moral solicitudes, and be drawn away into a loftier region by the attraction of another's heavenly mind, shall complain no more of want of will, but find his heart, thus brought at last to simplicity and love, endowed with a strength not felt before. . . . Strength is born to the Christian out of silence; and the soul, still as the mountain solitudes and pure as its snows, comes melted down upon the world with the force of the torrent and the fertility of the lake." And if aspiration is still in advance of achievement, the conscience, having found its union with God, learns to trust him for the rest, and believe his love greater than its guilt.

To understand Paul's Doctrine of the Cross we must put ourselves back to the point of view at which the writer stood. To him the Messianic mission was still future. In what light, then, would he naturally regard the Messiah's death? To answer this we must consider what, in his view, would have happened if Christ had not died. The Galilean ministry would have lost its preliminary character; and the foes of the Messiah, that is, nearly the whole of mankind, would have been already destroyed. Their rescue, therefore, was to be ascribed to the delay occasioned by Christ's death. Had the Messiah pro-

cured this delay by hiding himself for a time, his mission would still have been confined to Israel; but by death he destroyed the limiting conditions of lineage and clime. The alternative, therefore, presented itself to the mind of Paul that, if Christ had not died, the Gentiles, as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, must have perished. This doctrine might be shared by Peter or James. But while they excused the cross as the condition of the resurrection, Paul gloried in it, and "found all the lines of Providence shooting through the ages to converge upon it. This further conception was founded on a doctrine of Incarnation and twofold nature in Christ of which there is no trace in the attendants on the historical Jesus." It is obvious that this whole system of language belongs to parties and relations long since extinct, being founded on the obsolete expectation of a personal and speedy return of the Messiah to reign on the earth. But gracious and beautiful truths have come out of these temporary conceptions, and indeed "lurk secretly among them in the Apostle's noble writings, impregnating them with life the most imperishable and power the most creative."

The Divine Government was founded on a certain primary intent, for which this earth had been created. The world was designed as a tenancy for a race of immortal men. But there were moral considerations which placed the problem under certain restraining limits. None but the holy could be immortal, and none could be holy who were not free. The first parents were not really free; for being formed of earthly material, they carried in them the native evil and incapacity of the flesh. The only consequence entailed by the fall on succeeding generations was their removal from the tree of life, and abandonment to their natural mortality. To keep alive in men the idea of a plan which was by no means baffled, God selected one race, in whose line he absolutely promised that the scheme should be fulfilled; and, conditionally on their observing the required terms, the whole tribe was to have the benefits of the restoration. The criterion to which they were exposed was a new Law; but when the hour of accomplishment arrived, the Restorer was rejected and crucified. The trial being ended, "Israel must lapse convicted into the herd of nations." Christ, however, had remained sinless, and so reversed the case of Adam, and realised the Creator's conception of a man. This sinlessness was due, not only to his personal will, but to the fact that he was "spirit" before he was born in the flesh, "the heavenly model of that humanity of

which Adam was the earthly type; the 'Son of God,' constituted of that deathless essence, identical with the Divine, which is the native seat of holiness. . . . In this its real form our humanity had passed through all the conditions of sin without its taint, and experienced its mortal penalty without being held by it. He, to whom it was not due, having endured what was due to us, God responds by letting his spiritual nature spread to us, and making us a present of a righteousness we could never win." The righteousness, thus begun in fiction, would end in fact, the way being open for the trial of a nobler influence, and the spirit of heavenly love availing to sanctify those whom fear and stringent precept had addressed in vain. It was only past guilt that was overlooked; responsibility for the future remained. This was "a plan *foreseen* in all its relations, adjusted in all its issues from the first; its duration measured with infinite exactitude; its seeming failure essential to its final triumph; the parties in it predestined, and their parts discerned as integral elements in the series." The foreelection, however, is applied only to classes of persons, and not to individuals; and with faith in the divine prescience Paul unites the persuasion of the moral freedom of man. In the theology of Paul God could not prevent the aberrations of men without abandoning the whole principle of a moral judgment. If it be said that God might have prevented the sinner from coming into existence, "the force of this rejoinder is destroyed by the Apostle's entire silence respecting any of the dreadful punishments beyond the grave whereby, if the common theory were true, the guilty life might be predominantly a curse." The due penalty is limited to simple death.

Once possessed of the conception of an invisible fraternity of the good, subsisting amid the ills of the world, it is impossible for us not to desire that it should be rendered perceptible to the eye as well as to the mind, and that the dispersed members of the blessed brotherhood should convert their unconscious affinity into an association consciously existing. This, when realised, gives us the genuine idea of a Church, — "an idea which, thus interpreted, is the special and glorious gift of Christianity." Paul's conception of a Church agrees in its essential spirit with our own; but "while the *spirit* of his thoughts is incapable of ever becoming obsolete, their *form* belongs entirely to his age, and was affected by the peculiarity and imperfections of his theory of the Messiah." He was not providing for a distant future, but only for the small remnant of years before the end of the world; and his object was to

bring into visible communion those whom God had already reserved for the Messiah's kingdom, "to frame an *incorporated college of Immortals;* some of whom might fall asleep ere the promised privilege were given; but most would altogether escape the Death-law, and find their mortality swallowed up in life." The mode of admission to this community was Baptism, of which the preliminary condition was simply faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ, and a willingness to die to all earthly things for his sake. This was followed by the gift of the Holy Spirit. "What precisely this Spirit was; . . . what were its outward marks and inward experiences, are questions of the deepest interest, but of the most hopeless uncertainty." We cannot decipher the mystic secrets of God-like souls; for "nothing spiritual, nothing holy, nothing belonging to the highest order of truth and beauty, admits of being defined, and by the very attempt loses its character at once and becomes something else; and as for the consciousness of God within the soul, the understanding can no more comprehend it than the tree can tear itself up and look into its own roots."

The Lord's Supper served to express the brotherhood of the believers, to link them to the object of their faith in Heaven, and to span the years from their Lord's humiliation to his glorious return. It was a fraternal meeting for the evening meal; "with no authoritative president and no consecrating hand; and without any mystic magic in the elements, except what lies in all the symbolism of reverence and love." The significance of Baptism has quite ceased, but the essential idea of the Lord's Supper remains undisturbed. "The reminiscence of the perfect Christ, the brotherhood of all his followers, the hope of the everlasting Heaven are ours . . . and must abide with the Church while any trust in God, and love and sanctity, and faith in immortality remain."

The concluding sermon on "Paul in Christendom" speaks of the effect of the Apostle's preaching on the world. Three leading conceptions are selected for remark. First, he has brought home to the consciousness of Christian times "a sense of the *moral impotency* of the human will." The needed power must "proceed from a new affection, so deep, so pure, so entrancing, as to bring us back to that self-oblivion which guilt had destroyed, . . . and surprise us into devotedness to some fresh object of confidence and love." "It is the characteristic of the regeneration to which a high faith and love like that of Christ conduct the mind, that the disciple converses eye to eye with the highest vision of sanctity, grows into spontaneous

congeniality with it, and aspires to immediate identity with it. And to this intentness of soul, abandoning itself utterly to him, God gives a glorious success; his own divinest spirit comes in as an ally, and he is felt to unite himself benignly with the profoundest deeps of the willing conscience. He is everywhere working within us then to will and to do. This great moral truth, of the emancipating energy of the unconscious affections and the feebleness of the self-interested will, is the right interpretation of the doctrine of Justification by Faith and the impotence of Law." Secondly, to Paul must be attributed the pervading sense of the mystery of the Divine Decrees. "The idea of responsibility is too deeply cut into the very substance of Christianity to vanish from any of its forms. And this being the case, it is an unspeakable good that the mystery of foreknowledge is thrown out to awe the heart. It is well that we should feel our life to be the meeting-point of Free-will and of Necessity; that we should be impelled to act, yet brought to suffer; that with our hand we should go forth and conquer, and in our heart lie still and obey. It is needful, I believe, to the depth and loftiness of the character that this solemn mystery should be felt, brooding over us with its palpable darkness, breaking up our vain self-confidence, and drawing us to the shelter of the everlasting God." Lastly, Paul has "placed the world and life on the felt verge and confines of immortality. . . . We owe to him that glorious mountain view of our existence, with the little hospice of life in the foreground and the far landscape of infinite being beyond, interspersed with the broad shadows of a Divine protection and the still lakes of an everlasting peace."

In 1847 an interesting event occurred which deserves a moment's notice. Mr. Martineau was invited to deliver a course of lectures on Political Economy in the Room attached to Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, so that they might be heard by young men who were desirous of studying the subject, but were unable to attend his classes at the College. The fee for the course was fixed at six guineas, and the audience was composed of sixteen young men, chiefly engaged in commercial pursuits. Among them was one of the clerks in an office in the town, who took notes, and then redelivered the course to several of his friends

who had subscribed for his attendance. Mr. Walter Ashton was one of those who availed themselves of this opportunity; and in a letter of April 10, 1900, he says: "Mr. Martineau used to remain at the College till the evening, and with his black bag full of books, and slung on his umbrella over his shoulder, he would trudge along down Oxford Road to the Chapel vestry.[1] I remember as distinctly as if it were yesterday, on my way to the Lecture, offering to carry his bag, which he declined, regarding the matter as trifling. And when the Lecture was over (about 8 o'clock) he would shoulder his bag again, and trudge cheerily along to Victoria Station on his way home to Liverpool."

In February, 1848, the "Prospective Review" contained, under the title of "Philosophical Christianity in France,"[2] a criticism of a work by Athanase Coquerel. A quotation may be given, showing once more that Mr. Martineau's religion was not the result of intellectual discussion, but rested on a basis of its own: "We are fully alive to the importance of harmonising faith and science, so long as each retains its own ground, its own method, its own language. But we do not love to see religion playing the lackey to philosophy; aping its pomps, assuming its livery, and standing behind its chair." Another passage expresses his conception of the nature of Christianity: "We are content to receive at the hands of Christianity the pure truths of natural piety, cleared from all that oppresses and degrades them. We receive these, however, through the mind of Christ, and deeply coloured by the transmission. His divine life has disclosed a fresh image and ideal of human perfection;—changed and raised the standard of aspiration;—and, above all, furnished a new type, representative of God,

[1] It was not the vestry, but a larger room which was used for classes and other purposes.

[2] Reprinted in Essays, II.

and determining the spirit of every heavenly hope. In this, his personal occupancy of our reverential and trustful affections, has consisted, we believe, the essential power of Christianity."

On Tuesday, the 9th of May, 1848, the foundation stone of the new church in Hope Street was laid, in the presence of a large assemblage, some five hundred ladies and gentlemen, by Mr. Thomas Bolton. There was an hour's delay during the preparation of the stone, which had only arrived by rail that morning from Bath; but the glorious weather and the comfortable sitting-accommodation which had been provided enabled the spectators to spend the time with equanimity. After the stone had been laid Mr. Martineau delivered an address, which was fully reported in "The Christian Reformer," and was reprinted along with the farewell sermon. He declared, while elaborating each thought in his own choice language, that they dedicated the church to no priestly offices, to no individual's teaching, to no creed. In regard to the last point he said that it was plainly the law of Providence that there should be a perpetual change in the forms under which the same indestructible ideas operated in our nature, and it was "time that this should be openly recognised as fact, and allowed for in our provisions for the future." Nevertheless they were not "individually without definite belief, or, collectively, without a belief strongly marked by common characteristics." They were raising, "not a school, but a church; not a hall of debate, but a shrine of God"; and "for this end there must be a faith in each not wandering far from the faith of all. Only where there is essentially *one* heart and mind can the many find themselves represented by the breathings of a single spirit. We do not look, therefore, for the presence of various creeds *together;* we simply offer no hindrance to their appearing *successively.*" He and his hearers were Unitarians; but to stamp the church with "such doc-

trinal name would be to perform an act of posthumous expulsion against many noble dead whom it is an honour to revere; and perhaps to provoke against ourselves, from a future age, the retribution of a like excommunication." On the positive side, he said that in whatever way men owned the authority, and found the aliment, of devout convictions and aspirations, and associated for the expression of them, there was a Church; and that was specifically a Christian Church which accepted Jesus of Nazareth as (under the limitations of humanity) the realisation of this ideal, "the blending point of historical fact and divine perfection." "In a word, then," he said, "we unite for advancement of the *Christian Life*. The whole sphere of our thought we would bring into harmony with the image of Christ's mind: in our worship, looking up through it to God; in our efforts of will, lifting ever nearer to it both ourselves and the world." In this attempt there was nothing *exclusive;* and in the cluster of neighbouring churches they discerned only a fraternity of coadjutors whose work, — a part of the same husbandry of God, — lay in a field their tillage could not reach. Nor was there in this attempt anything *temporary and perishable;* "for there is in the soul of man 'a temple not made with hands,' which demands and shapes forth the visible structure as its shell of life; which is ever fresh amid the change and wreck of ages, and can build again from the ruins of the past; indeed, the hidden cloister of whose worship will remain still open, and thrill with higher strains, when time and its structures shall be no more." Other speakers, representing neighbouring congregations, gave short addresses, and among them the Rev. J. J. Tayler, who spoke with the warmest affection and appreciation of his "friend and brother."

On the 16th of July Mr. Martineau preached his last sermon in Paradise Street. This sermon, entitled "Pause and Retrospect: or, a Minister's Aims Reviewed," departs from

his usual practice of avoiding every personal element, and throws a valuable light upon the aims and spirit of his ministry. A few extracts must suffice. "Nothing has been nearer to my heart than *to substitute among you the Religion of Consciousness for the Religion of Custom.*" "Precisely in proportion as the affections are pure and deep, the conscience clear and strong, and the imagination familiar with great and beautiful examples, —are heavenly realities discerned, and the windows of Reason thrown open to the empyrean light." "Moral and emotional disorder as effectually excludes religious truth, as intellectual mania vitiates ordinary judgment; and the best schooling will teach nothing, till the wounded nature is healed, and the fever of the soul abates." "We may touch a sense which had never revealed itself before; we may begin a low sweet music, at which the sleeping soul may turn with wondering face, and gently cross the bridge of dreams, and open at length the living eye, and say, 'What world is this; and wherefore am I here?'" "I have known from myself, and have felt for others, that when once we have descended to the true springs of devotion in our nature, doubts and fears spontaneously clear away." "I have also wished to elicit *the moral beauty, the inherent sublimity, and the natural authority of Christianity.*" "The imperfect media through which the incidents of the Advent are transmitted to our knowledge may render it difficult to obtain assurance as to many of its external facts. But they leave no doubt as to that grand central figure in which all that is august and tender in the religion is collected and impersonated." "Nothing surely can have *authority* with us, save that which touches the seat of all authority, — the conscience." "This appreciation of Jesus, resting upon intrinsic personal ascendancy of soul, being once secured, the historical limitations of his life, its human colouring with the sentiments of a nation and a time, lie outside its *religious* office,

its relation to our faith and trust; they become simple matters of secular criticism; and the temporary form of the first Christianity is harmonised with the essential perpetuity." "If I think the *records,* which are the vehicle of Christianity, less perfect than I once supposed; if they leave some things uncertain, on which I should be grateful to be assured; if the element of Hellenistic theory and Jewish misconception seems larger than I had thought; yet all this does but disengage the inspired Author in greatness more solitary and signal; and, by substituting for the vague gaze of reverence, a real, human view of that amazing time, fills me with a far deeper interest in the men, and a profounder trust in the religion." "Another favourite task with me has been *to find some 'soul of goodness in things evil,'* not indeed in things *morally* evil, . . . but in things *intellectually* wrong." "We have always something to learn, till we have traced the beliefs which we disown and others trust, up to their inmost seat in human nature, and detected what good and holy thing it is, which they poorly struggle to express. This insight gained, we dissent no longer with the heat of a narrow antipathy, but with the quiet of a large sympathy. . . . Thus only can truly deep-souled and Catholic charity be reached." "I have sought, with an urgency of heart which I believe no failure can exhaust, to give you a sense of *the Infinite Nature of Duty.*" "Infinitude attaches not, as is generally conceived, merely to *quantities,* like Space and Time, but to certain *qualities,* as Beauty and Sanctity. The Universe . . . has infinity of one kind; the free human Soul, which may be fair and good, has infinity of the other. In God the two currents of immensity mingle, and make one shoreless ocean of perfection." "But now, having said thus much, I start back at the Image I have raised. I shrink before it abashed and humbled. When I look at the pure ideal of the Christian Life, . . . I am bent down in consciousness of deformity and defect;

and, did I dwell on the reflections which fill me with distrust, I should lay down a burden too noble for me to bear. . . . This one thing gratitude requires me to say, that the good providence of God has, in some way and degree, supplied my manifold defects; enabling us at the end of this stage of our career to look round on a Society, not weakened in numbers, or, I trust, degenerate in spirit."

It had been arranged that Mr. Martineau was to have, during the building of the church, a much-needed leave of absence for a year, which he intended to spend with his family in Germany. On the 21st of September, 1847, he addressed a letter to the Chapel Committee, asking for a year's absence. He was beginning to feel that continuous mental exertion in the same direction, year after year, was producing some lassitude and anxiety, which could be easily dissipated by withdrawing the pressure for a while. "I sincerely believe," he wrote, "that a year's absence, especially if passed amid new scenes, and in the unusual attitude of *learning* rather than *teaching,* would enable me to begin work in the new Chapel with powers refreshed; and render the remainder of my life a less worthless offering than it would otherwise become." He offered to bear the cost of providing the most acceptable substitute that could be induced to undertake a temporary engagement; but the congregation, in granting his request, took this burden on themselves, and the Rev. Joseph Henry Hutton was engaged to occupy the vacant pulpit.

More even than of recruited strength he felt the want of enlarged study for his Academic work; and, recognising the reasonableness of this feeling, the College also had consented to dispense with his services for a session.

He expected to start for Hamburg on the 29th of July; and meanwhile he was anxious to let his house. Early in June he succeeded in letting it for a year to Sir William Warre, Commander of the forces for the district, at a rent

of £260, free of taxes, but only on condition of the family's vacating on the 25th, more than a month before their departure for the continent. However, his sister Rachel was able to place her house, 36 Upper Parliament Street, at their disposal for a month, and the week which was still left was passed at Farmfield, the residence of the Misses Yates. At this time he was uneasy about his mother's health. She was repairing to Birmingham, and he was so unwilling to let her go thither unaccompanied that, in spite of her refusal, he went to the station, with all his things packed up, to go with her; but she persisted in her independence. As we shall see, they did not meet again.

It has been mentioned in the foregoing account that Mr. Martineau was in the habit of giving systematic religious instruction to members of his congregation on Sunday mornings, and sometimes in the afternoon as well. He thought that the services in the Chapel should have nothing to disturb the devotional frame of mind, but that nevertheless people should be acquainted with the intellectual basis of their faith, and that, for the benefit of religion itself, theological study should keep pace with the advance of knowledge in other directions. A lady, who was quite capable of exercising her own thought, and differed from him on the subject of miracles, writes (Oct. 7, 1843): "I have returned from Mr. Martineau's class. He is my type of intellectual and moral beauty. It is a delight to be near him, to listen to the tones of his voice, when he is speaking of what interests him. How he descends to the comprehension of those who cannot fully appreciate him, how kindly he bears with the dull or indifferent; and how delighted he seems when he has led the mind higher, and drawn it forth from prejudices, and set it on the road to search out truth for itself. What a blessing it must be to him, to think

how many he has raised above mere worldly pursuits, and though he may not elevate them to his own high standard, has brought them to love and search after knowledge, truth, and virtue. His influence is incalculable." The lectures were delivered extempore, so that there is no full record of them; but eight little volumes of notes, carefully made at the time by one of his hearers, came into the hands of Professor Dowden, of Trinity College, Dublin, who very kindly lent them for the purpose of this biography. It may interest the reader to see some extracts which throw a further light upon Mr. Martineau's theological position at this time. The notes are not verbatim, so that the style is quite unfinished; but the meaning is sufficiently clear. The time of the lectures extends from Oct. 18, 1840, to Feb. 23, 1845; and the subject is the Gospels, the first three being treated synoptically.

He had already delivered a long course on the history of Christianity, and on the external evidences of the religion, and was now proceeding to the internal. He begins, however, with a notice of the acceptance of the Gospels in the early Church. Starting with Justin Martyr, he comes to this conclusion: "We cannot cite Justin Martyr as proof of the existence, at that time, of our Gospels in their present form; but we may cite him to prove that the general facts contained in ours were then received as the basis of Christianity." He thinks the canonical Gospels were selected out of a heap, on dogmatic grounds, "a fortunate and just selection indeed, but a proof of the triumphant success of a party." Nevertheless he thinks the Synoptics were written towards the end of the third quarter, or in the last quarter of the first century, mainly on the ground of the difficulty which a late writer experiences in avoiding anachronisms; but his opinions were already tending towards a more extreme position, for in January, 1842, he says a century may have elapsed before the events of the life of Christ were written down. In the same year he says: "We have no external evidence of the authenticity of Matthew and Mark, which were anonymous productions, brought to light, or at least first quoted, in the second half of the second century." Nevertheless he seems to assume that Matthew's Gospel was from the

Apostle, for he argues on the assumption that the writer was an eye-witness of many things; but whether this was a concession to those who took that view, or he believed that the Gospel incorporated apostolic elements, does not appear. He infers, however (June, 1841), from the agreement in the reports of the words of Christ, along with the variation in the facts, that notes of Christ's sayings were made very early, and that we have the very words which he used. This is said after an examination of the Sermon on the Mount. It is evident that in criticising the words and deeds ascribed to Jesus, he has formed a general impression of Christ's character and spirit, and rejects such details as seem inconsistent with this. In comparing the Gospels together, and judging which account is the more probable, he is guided chiefly by the verisimilitude and the suitability of the occasion, and frequently gives the preference to Luke as presenting a more natural occasion for many sayings. He insists frequently on the want of evidence that we have eye- and ear-witnesses, so that the statements which he receives are accepted on the general ground of their credibility, and he has no difficulty in rejecting what seems to him improbable, and in assigning a late date to sayings and parables which, in his judgment, bear marks of ecclesiastical origin. Nevertheless he is quite ready to accept supernatural events. He criticises and dismisses the views of the Rationalists, especially Paulus, on the ground that their explanations are opposed to the plain meaning of the narrative; but he does not much consider the question whether a natural occurrence may not in some instances have come to be misunderstood by the narrator.

In regard to the Gospel according to John, his views seem to have been undergoing a change. We have seen that at one time he regarded this as the most authentic of the Gospels, and in the earlier lectures his criticisms seem to show that he was still of this opinion. But in 1845, when he came to treat separately of this Gospel, he had completely joined the opponents of its authenticity. There are notes of only six lectures; but from these it appears that he was already convinced that the Gospel was unknown to Justin Martyr, Valentinus and his immediate disciples, Montanus, and Marcion; that the book therefore was probably diffused originally in Alexandria, and not in Asia Minor; and that Irenæus confounds the Apostle and the Presbyter, and even that to his "conscience it was not altogether repugnant to state as facts what he knew to be false."

The following classified extracts give his opinion on several important points.

Revelation. In commenting on the statement "the word of God came to him [the Baptist] in the desert," he says, "I apprehend that anyone who feels himself possessed spontaneously of ideas of whose truth he is unable to doubt, which he is unable to do otherwise than obey, is entitled to feel himself under the influence of a divine mission. Then with respect to its reception by others, I do not see any other test than this, that the utterance should produce a kindred state of mind to that of the speaker. If it appears mean and poor, incapable of commanding the belief, it will not of course induce their concurrence. But if he can kindle the same state of feeling without any process of argument, then he will be believed to have had a divine commission. This constitutes their only evidence. Deprive them of this, and you may accumulate miracles at will, but you will never produce the impression. The followers of John the Baptist apparently never asked at all for a miracle. The same thing might have been in the mind of Christ when he says the Jews' appealing to a miraculous evidence for belief in him was owing to their low state of mind. I do consider the English notion of there being no divine mission without miracle is contradicted by universal evidence. On this, as on some other subjects, the world is deeply indebted to the Society of Friends." [1]

Inspiration. He thinks the evidence shows that Christ believed in demoniacal possession, and that this view was wrong, and says: "What, then, are the consequences of this view? Will anyone say that it subverts the inspiration of Christ? That depends upon the idea we entertain of inspiration. If we mean scientific intellectual knowledge, this view will quite dispose of it; but I consider this notion of inspiration incorrect, and that if we could satisfy ourselves that he was indeed so inspired, we should obtain little good by the belief. It seems to me that since the Reformation too great importance has been given to scientific truth in reference to religious matters. There has been a sensitive and exaggerated shrinking from error whilst the real nature of inspiration, moral truth, has been lost sight of. Yet, if we look at the facts of the case, we shall find, whenever it has been most obvious that there was an infusion of the Divine Spirit in the world, this time has not been marked by discoveries in scientific truth; but it

[1] Jan. 17, 1841.

has been remarkable for the birth of minds in congeniality with the spirit of the age, aiming at some practical purpose. Look at the reformers of the world, — at the Apostles, at Wesley, the greatest reformer of our own times, — are not these instances of minds full of error? Yet does anyone deny that these men were sent upon a mission from God of the highest order? Accordingly, we must learn to dissociate moral from scientific truth, and not expect to find the one because we have the other. It is obvious that there must be some limit to the demand for intellectual truth, as infallibility cannot reside anywhere but with God. Had there been no sympathy between the Messiah and those whom he addressed, he could have persuaded, comparatively speaking, nobody; he would have had few hearers, and it would have been impossible for him to have established a church. It is owing to the points of agreement with his age that he has acted at all on the spirit of our own days." [1] "I believe that religion exists, not in the intellect, but in the conscience and affections of men, and where these are unfolded religious belief exists, and in the exact proportion in which they are unfolded. It is clear that Christianity operates in this way, and that it was by sympathy with Christ that it propagated itself. I do not therefore hesitate to attribute to Christ and his Apostles a belief in whatever opinions of their time and country they appear to have held, and in so doing I do not believe that I am in the least infringing on their authority. We must go to Christ, not as to a philosopher, but to a God-like being able to awaken the conscience and the heart, and in matters of this kind empowered to represent the God whom we adore." [2]

Miracles. On Christ's temptation to throw himself from the pinnacle of the temple, he says: "I would remark that this appears to me at variance with the common theory of the peculiar function of miracles. If their purpose be to convince mankind of the divine inspiration of the performer, then I would ask how could Jesus consider it a sin to make the most conspicuous display of his power? Only on the supposition that this consideration was inferior to their beneficent influence. Moreover, when Jesus is asked for a miracle, expressly as a proof of his divine mission, he always refuses." [3] About the calming of the storm, he says the explanations which make it natural "can only be recommended . . . to those who think that miracles are to be got rid of at all hazards. For myself,

[1] April 11, 1841. [2] April 18, 1841. [3] Feb. 7, 1841.

I cannot in this way disintegrate the narrative, and I do not hesitate to admit the miracle." [1] He thinks the sending of the demons into the swine and the destruction of the latter, and also the blighting of the fig-tree, so contrary to Christ's general character that he cannot believe them, "as they bear internal evidence of being fictitious." "Whether there is any foundation whatever for this narrative [of the swine] it is impossible to say." [2] He thinks we cannot get rid of the miraculous from the raising of Jairus' daughter, though there may be exaggeration. "At the same time it may not be necessary for a believer in Christianity to believe in the miracles. They have served the purpose of maintaining faith in Christ, but now perhaps it may be permitted to rest on other grounds." [3]

"As it appears that the different decisions passed in this room have produced perplexity in some minds as to how we shall distinguish between what miracles we are to receive and what to reject, I shall therefore devote the remainder of this lecture to some remarks upon miracles in general, and on the principles which should guide us in the reception of them. All the modern school of anti-supernaturalists start with the assumption that a miracle is impossible, and that no evidence is sufficient to make them credible. Although this is not distinctly stated by them, and even perhaps they would not themselves agree to it, yet they endeavour in all cases to show that the historical evidence is unequal to prove the miracle. Now this position, I think, involves all others, and this I am prepared to resist to the very last; and I say that there is nothing to render them incredible if we have sufficient evidence. Surely anyone will admit that there were miracles at the commencement of all religion. Have we not the miracle of creation? Creation is the calling into existence things which have never been before, and what is this but wholesale miracle? Even if we say that the successive birth of animals and the progressive growth of vegetables are only natural events, yet it will be admitted that the first of every species is out of the present order of nature, and so we are obliged to have recourse to the existence of other powers to explain the origin of these new beings. We must, then, believe in the existence of one powerful God, possessing a prior claim to our homage, as having powers and exercising them before the order of nature was established. From all this it naturally follows that all which occurs in the order of nature is at least (if we may say so)

[1] Nov. 14, 1841. [2] Nov. 28, 1841. [3] Dec. 5, 1841.

genealogically derived from a miracle. If this be admitted as a past fact, and if we conceive that the same Being exists still, surely the power is alive and active still out of which miracles arise. I conceive, therefore, that the primary assumption, that miracles are impossible, cannot be borne out; and what we now require to know is, what *quantum* of evidence is necessary to belief. So everyone who begins with the assertion that no evidence is conclusive shows himself quite unfit to make the examination at all. We now arrive at this point, — given a sufficient *quantum* of evidence the miracle is proved; wanting that, it breaks down. In all cases the external evidence is the same, at least in the same Gospel. But it is the internal evidence — the probability of the natural circumstances connected with the event, the consistency of the narrative with itself, with the other accounts of the same event, and with the general character of Christ — which gives us reasonable grounds for saying that it is a miracle worthy of belief. I say, then, that there are some miracles which I cannot disbelieve; there are others which are inconsistent with the life of Christ, such as the blasting of the fig-tree, which I must reject. With respect to the nature of the evidence, I am free to admit that I do not consider the external evidence of the three first Gospels as at all sufficient to prove any one miracle they relate. And further, if the Gospels told any miracles such as we find in apocryphal books, I could not believe them; nay, I also say that some of those books are quite as ancient, and their authenticity is quite as well established, and yet I would not for a moment believe one of the miracles there related. But, happily for us, external evidence is not all we have to rest upon; something more is wanting, and this is afforded us by the very parallel we have just drawn between our Gospels and the apocryphal books, which instantly introduces the mind to a new species of evidence. Read the Gospel of Nicodemus, for instance, and say which of the miracles there can for a moment be compared with the purity of even the lowest recorded in the other Gospels. The writers, when left to themselves, at once departed from the Christian temper. We are constantly struck with the contrast even in works of the same external authority. The one gives the most melancholy and even contemptible view of mankind and of religion, the other the most noble and holy impressions of the character of Christ and his teachings. We may explain this contrast in this way; the uninspired minds of that age were totally unable to give anything equal to our own Gospels. Still we come to this con-

clusion after all, that the moral and spiritual character of the religion makes the miracles credible, not that the miracles make the religion so. If we are devoid of the power of seeing the beauty of the moral character of Christ, we shall be unable to believe his miracles; and in virtue of their being interlocked with a system of the highest moral and spiritual excellence, they become credible. I do not deny that it is possible that several of the miracles may be after-ascriptions to Christ when the influence of his character had become defined in the minds of his followers, and when the general veneration of the Church was directed to Jesus. This would probably be the case; and if the minds of a generation had been so frequently disturbed by the departure from the general order of nature, we may easily believe that the waters would not subside at once. For some time it would be impossible to avoid a tendency to deviate in some degree from the exact facts. So we may expect that in our Canon we have both real and fictitious miracles. But, after all, I do not think that this detracts from the impression which the supernatural events of the Scriptures ought to leave on our minds. The mind of Christ must have produced a similar impression upon his followers to enable them to imagine such incidents, and, if they were invented, it was only so far as Christ created in them this power of invention, for his character was the model they took. Thus they would serve the purpose of attracting attention to the real character of Christ. So I do not think that whether or not they are really true is a matter of much moment; for they showed the belief that Christ was capable of working such miracles, and this is the impression that ought to be left on our minds. By whatever means this impression is effected is, I apprehend, of but little consequence." [1]

Prayer and Free-Will. In connection with Luke xi. 1-13, he vindicates the doctrine of prayer against "the modern idea that our prayers are useless because they will not change the decrees of God." This leads him to consider the doctrines of necessity and free-will. "The divine and human wills are exempt [from necessity]; and if this position seems startling, I will admit, if you like, that the human will is supernatural, — has power over the natural element of man. The whole doctrine never can be brought into harmony with the consciousness of any human being. Everyone feels that he *can* act either one way or another, and that he has done wrong in

[1] Dec. 19, 1841.

yielding to temptation, because he might have done otherwise. This very consciousness of wrong natural to our minds in such circumstances is an argument against the doctrine of necessity." [1]

"I conceive that the basis of the prayer recommended by Jesus is faith in the Being to whom it is addressed, and also a reservation of submission, a feeling of doubt as to the success of the petition, and therefore a preparation for trust in case of disappointment. . . . We may call the fit state of mind a foreground of faith in the possibility of whatever is good, and a background of resignation in whatever may be the result. I conceive these to be the conditions on which Jesus offers the promise of an answer. . . . If so, it is evident that prayer should not be considered as being the instrument so much as the expression, — it should not be used as a means of getting, but should come from us as the habitual expression of a state of mind. I have said that I do not conceive any particular form of words as necessary, and I should be the last to require it or anything but the state of mind. The devotional temper *is* a prayer as much as the words can be which compose one, and the term prayer, though convenient as expressing the idea of petition, does not necessarily imply a form of words in supplication. Still I never could enter into the objection which some scrupulous persons have as to the utterance of prayer. I think if the desire is there it *should* express itself, and where we feel its want we don't stop to consider its use, but act at once spontaneously. The doctrine of Jesus is clearly, I think, that the temper and state of mind are what are necessary; but that the expression should accompany the wish is only natural." [2]

Immortality. Having traced the gradual change in the belief of the Christians about the future, from the earthly Messianic kingdom to spiritual immortality, he says: "We often see in the arrangements of Providence an evolvement of truth through events rather than by actual declaration. An idea is slowly developed by circumstances till on its clear appearing it is intuitively adopted by the heart as truth; and this particular view of a future world (that of a spiritual and immediate joining of the dead to an assembly in another state) I do firmly believe to be the true one. It comes so home to the human heart that I believe it will never be parted with, but belong for ever to it as a portion of its natural convictions." [3]

[1] Dec. 4, 1842. [2] Dec. 11, 1842. [3] Oct. 9, 1842.

In connection with the argument with the Sadducees, he maintains that the doctrine of immortality was not revealed or proved by Christianity, but was an accepted doctrine already. He shows that it was universal (with the exception of particular doubters or deniers of it), and he rests it upon two grounds,—metaphysical and moral. First is the intuitive conviction, the natural belief that we are composite, and that the spirit is immaterial and separable from the fortunes of the body. "If we are to be convinced of the contrary, we must have a revelation for that. Thus a divine revelation is required, not to prove immortality, but to disprove it if it be really not true." Secondly, the belief "is folded up, as is the life of the tree in the bud, in the very conception of right and wrong, of action and responsibility. A reference to a law above us exists in our natural feeling of rewards and punishments, of a Power divinely conceived, but still over us inevitably, and these ideas absolutely involve the conception of a state in which this law will act." He concludes that "nothing can shake our convictions of the immortality of the soul, and our accountability in a future life." [1]

Messiahship. "Jesus did not thus announce himself [as the Messiah], I think, till near the end of his ministry; but after the transfiguration he began to speak publicly of himself as Messiah." [2] "The Messianic reign on earth seemed to be what he at first anticipated, and it was not till afterwards that the true end of his earthly existence opened itself to him. At first all his preparations were for an earthly, personal influence, — the sending out messengers to prepare the way for him, and for his teaching and government in a *present* capacity. Afterwards all his arrangements seemed made for the purpose of carrying out his gospel in his personal absence, and for the preaching of others in his stead after his removal." [3] He always assumes that Jesus was really the Messiah. He explains the charge that they should tell no man, after Peter's confession, as due to "the reported failure of the mission of the Apostles. They were not able to implant the belief in his Messiahship." For he thinks the people whom Christ asks about were those whom the Apostles met in their mission to the various towns.[4]

Teetotalism. On the passage about Christ's being a wine-bibber he says: "It seems, if I might step aside, and speak of

[1] Oct. 8, 1843.
[2] May 9, 1841.
[3] May 21, 1843.
[4] Dec. 26, 1841.

the controversies of the present day, that these verses must exceedingly perplex the arguments of the scriptural total abstainers. If they could be satisfied with rational arguments and with showing the propriety of abstaining, it would be well; but when they try for divine authority, they can only obtain it by violently straining the Scripture narratives. Our Saviour would never have been exposed to the calumny of 'a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber' if he had abstained entirely. I think it is always wrong to strain the morality of feeling, and to endeavour to find motives for it which are forced and unnatural." [1]

A perusal of the foregoing extracts will make it clear that Mr. Martineau was prepared to give sympathetic attention to Baur's work on "The Canonical Gospels," which appeared in 1847. He says himself that in his re-study of the New Testament writings he was greatly helped by "Baur and Co.," and that "Baur's masterly handling of his historical materials had impressed me so much before my year's visit, with my family, to Germany in 1848-9, that I had hesitated whether to take up our abode (for study and education) at Tübingen, or in Berlin. In deciding on the latter, I was influenced chiefly by the consideration that the special advantage of the former was to be had in books accessible anywhere, while Berlin was rich in unprinted interests, social and artistic, beyond what a library could secure." [2]

LETTERS, 1832–1848

TO THE REV. ORVILLE DEWEY.

LIVERPOOL, Oct. 3, 1844.

. . . You were pleased that Thom and I did not sign the Clerical Anti-Slavery Address. Your approbation, dear friend, I ought, perhaps, to set off against the obloquy which our refusal brings upon us here. Yet, perverse that I am, your satisfaction frightens me more than the railings of others; so fearful am I of appearing for a moment to concur in the views of duty in this great matter, of which you have now established yourself as the ablest and most prominent expounder. You have exactly expressed my reason for not signing, when you say, "it is hard for grown men to bow to mere monition."

[1] Feb. 13, 1842.

[2] From a letter to Mr. Jackson, June 12, 1897.

The end proposed by that address has my heartiest and deepest sympathy. I stood aloof because the method adopted appeared to me ill-adapted to advance the end. I saw in it no power of influence and some danger of provocation. But could I discern any means by which the Christianity of your country could be roused to take its true position in relation to slavery, — above all, any means by which the large force of your soul and speech could be consecrated to the cause of nature and of right, — I would seize them at any cost. Since reading the article on "American Morals and Manners," I have irrevocably made up my mind that you have got into a wrong position, — the exigences of which your genius and character are too noble to serve. With all the great ingenuity of your understanding, the sophistical apology for wrong is not natural to you; and for once your eloquent pen is inefficient. God and your own heart of hearts have put you in all things on the side of justice, humanity and freedom, which has associated with it every great name in history since the slave-question arose. My dear Dewey, what business have you among the ranks of those who have nothing but dollars and doubts to plead against the primary claims of Nature and the Human Soul? You will say I am in a distant country and cannot judge. But is not a remote position like the future time favourable to the calm, clear sight of human relations and duties? Forgive my earnestness in this matter; to an ordinary man one might speak more slightly, but you are too considerable to be lost from any true cause without prayers and tears. Channing began with objecting to the Abolitionists. So did Emerson; so did you. The future age will reckon all three among the most powerful agents of Emancipation, will it not?

Theodore Parker struck and delighted us much; a man of vast acquirement and large grasp of mind; and so fresh and simple. He preached for me and for Thom; for what are we that, for any heresies, we should disown such a man? I cannot but expect great things from him.

LIVERPOOL, Dec. 2, 1844.

That Texan Sermon fairly subdues my habit of tardy correspondence, and extorts from me instant and rejoicing thanks. Send me such a missive once a month, and you will convert me from my procrastinating ways, and pray for a return to the old sparse crop of letters.

I will not weary you with the one subject which, I perceive, is painful to you. I knew you would speak out, and not allow

your resistance to our importunate and perhaps ill-graced demands to suppress the impulses of your higher Reason and nobler heart. The questions involved in your Election contests no doubt presented a happy opportunity. I grieve to see that your party is virtually defeated; and I suppose the Annexation must follow. The *practical* tendency of such a measure to postpone the approaching extinction of slavery, I clearly see. But I am not so sure of the soundness of your moral argument against it. I do not perceive how you can make the possession of slaves by Texas a bar to its admission into your confederation, while your own States already hold them in bondage, and in their own Legislatures do everything to confirm the possession, and in Congress forbid all petitions and discussions on the subject in reference to the District of Columbia. Once enter upon a Course of Public Acts, showing that the *present mind* of the Nation *is* intent on the cessation of the wrong, and you can say with some face to Texas, "We have scruples of conscience about your slaves; we are going to work *against* the perpetuity of this system, — you are wanting to extend and confirm it; the two policies cannot go on together." But, whatever be the private sentiments of individual citizens, are you yet in a position, from your *National Acts*, to hold this language before the world? May you not naturally be asked for some indications of the anxiety to get rid of slavery, which you think to be so prevalent? Where does it appear? What effort, what plan, what proposal, for the cure of the evil, does it produce? Do your statesmen grapple with the subject? Do your public men find that there is a demand for some wise method of deliverance from the system, and seek to build their reputation on the success of their suggestions? Do your great writers find an earnest acceptance, or an angry reproach, for their endeavours to set the matter in its true light? If the Press, the Pulpit, the Legislative Hall — constituting the entire public voice of the Nation — all give their suffrage for non-disturbance of the existing relations, — can you expect much faith from the world without in an anxiety apparently barren? You often allude, and in terms of reproach which we amply deserve, to the condition of our poor. You cannot probe this sore too often or too deep; you shall have my blessing, as our physician, every time you tell us the sad truth on this head. But see whether this difference does not hold; — while the remedy is so much more obscure and less palpable than any plan of slave emancipation, that I doubt whether you could tell us what to do, our confes-

sion of the wrong is cordial, open, universal, poured through every channel by which the sentiment of any class finds its way; and every variety of ameliorative experiment is either in actual operation, or (like Free Trade) in process of enforcement upon a reluctant Aristocracy. With all this, Heaven knows there is apathy enough among us still. Would that we (*i. e.,* England and America) could vie with one another, only in the earnestness with which we address ourselves to our own particular social miseries and sins.

But I never wished you to be numbered among the Abolitionist ranks. I have always disapproved of the course which that party took, and admired the Independent position which Channing assumed. In this respect my sister Harriet and I have always held different opinions. Is there not now room for a new party who shall [? take] up the subject practically and meet the social and [? political] difficulties of the question, keeping in view its moral bearings enough to enlist and maintain the enthusiasm of all Christian people, yet abstaining from inflammatory speech; in short, a party to secure and to regulate that very *discussion* to which you look with hope? But enough; I have broken my promise of forbearance and wearied you again.

Since I last wrote, Thom and I have joined together, and with J. J. Tayler and Charles Wicksteed, in the Editorship of the "Christian Teacher," — whose name, by the way, we shall shortly change. It is time, we think, that the movement party in our body, distinguished by Spiritualism in Philosophy and a preference of an internal and "experimental" over an external and merely authoritative Christianity, should be adequately and avowedly represented; and the revived and dogged allegiance of our other Periodicals to the system of Priestley and Belsham has determined us to give voice to modes of thought which we deem truer and nobler, and which we know to have a wide though silent extension among us. As for our probable indiscretions, you are so accustomed to be frightened from your propriety by eccentricities of thought, that our greatest heresies will seem very tame to you, — hardly worth being heretical about. But I do assure you, you must read us if you would know how our particular portion of the church goes on.

LIVERPOOL, July 24, 1846.

Bad correspondent as I am, I am not an ungrateful friend; and must send you, however imperfectly, our affectionate acknowledgments for your gentle and faithful sympathy. Had

you known the child who is removed to a care far wiser, and not less loving, than ours, you would understand at once the greatness of our loss and of our consolation. He was a boy of rare genius, beauty, and affection; one made to be an ornament and wonder to life, while with us, and to give faith and sanctity to death, when claimed from us. His image remains, sometimes in its fading sadness, to cast a shade of sorrow across the passing hour; but usually in its saintly grace, to mediate between this rough, harsh world and the hidden place of rest and holiness where he abides our coming.

The minds of men, equally faithful and reflective, are, I am persuaded, so differently proportioned, that on matters of religious faith it is unsafe to draw conclusions from personal experience. Your vivid and impressive picture of doubt, suggested by internal affliction and relieved by external evidence, is to me a *history*, to which I find nothing corresponding in my own memory and heart. Not that I can pretend to have escaped the bitter strife and depression of doubt; but it has come amid the daylight, never in the gloom; through the laugh and turmoil of a cheerful world, not in tears and meditative solitude; in the battle of a fresh understanding with the difficulties of testimony and the snares of an intricate logic, never in surrender of heart to the Will of God and of Conscience to the severe call of Duty. I own I cannot explain how metaphysics are at fault here; but somehow sorrow brings its own evidences with it, and wants no witness to the truths it aspires to realise. I am firmly convinced that the Reverential Estimate we make of human nature lies at the root of all religious faith; and that it is by exalting this, through an exhibition of it in absolute perfection, that Christianity itself has its main operation; and that the very same series of external events, gathered around the person of one who was *not* a Jesus of Nazareth, would have no effect on the religion of the world. Bereavement — when death brings real loss to our deepest affections — forces us to feel how precious and sacred is a human life, how immeasurable the contents of a human soul, and so concurs in the impression which Christianity itself creates.

I could not hope for your approbation of the Article on Parker. But you mistake me if you think my "sympathies to be all with the miracle denier." I think such a person to be, not only *not a Christian,* but by necessity an *Atheist.* I believe in as much miracle as I ever did, — as much as the most conservative of our theologians. Only I discern the supernatural element more and more *in* Christ, less and less around him;

not diminishing the amount, but shifting the position from his outward life to his inward mind. This arises with me from two concurrent causes; partly from an altered philosophy, and a different view of the boundary line between nature and what is beyond nature; partly from a more thorough study of the external evidences, and a clear conviction that the testimony to the particular historical miracles is quite incapable of bearing the strain which I used to put upon it. Having, however, gained in one direction more than an equivalent for what I have lost in another, I do not think that the true disciple's attitude, owning the Divine authority, and loving the holy person, of the Great Master, was ever more natural to me than now. Forgive these few words of self-defence. . . .

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

3 MOUNT STREET, Dec. 26, 1837.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — To be associated in any way with the act of your life which, come what may, will never have its equal or its like in happiness, is a privilege which I never expected to enjoy; and which I could not have satisfactorily accepted, except on the failure of your far better hope from our friend Mr. White. It is a serious disappointment to me that you cannot have his public blessing to consecrate your union; and painful to me to find you speak so despondingly of the prospect of his much longer continuance with us. I trust that in this your spirit of sympathy has caught more than is reasonable of his own depression of mind. — Be assured, that even his venerable benediction, though far worthier, will not be more affectionate than mine; and I bless God that my prayers for you do not flow from a lonely heart, but from one bright with the light of a long domestic peace. Happily too, there is no difficulty in this case, in complying with the Scriptural injunction, and making them the "prayer of *faith*," "nothing doubting"; he must be a vehement sceptic who could get up a doubt in the matter. . . .

Ever your loving friend,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

MAY 10, 1838.

In my connexion with the "London Review," I have suffered so much from the ineffectual struggle to fulfil half-formed engagements, and have learned so thoroughly to distrust my own intentions in the way of literary production, that I

am resolved never to deceive others as I have deceived myself. Frankly and sorrowfully, then, I say to you what I often say to my own conscience, as to this matter of writing, *no reliance is to be placed on me.* From weakness either of understanding or of will, the task is to me a grievous and scarce tolerable travail; the severities of which prevent my doing as much as I could desire, in this way, for my congregation; and while my duty to them is imperfect, I have little right to make other engagements. You think I have materials by me; alas! I could not offer you such an affront as to send them. From all (with slightest exception) that I have written I turn away so ashamed that I sometimes wonder at the infatuation which impels me to go on, — ever humiliated at what I have done, yet in love with what I am to do. You must not, therefore, rely on me; I have nothing *in esse* worthy of your object; and to tender you that which is *in posse* would be — when you ask for bread — to give you a stone. . . .

You have extracted from me a confession which relieves me much.

JULY 20, 1841.

Your words of sympathy,[1] always delightful to me, were not the less so from their expressing a much more sorrowful estimate of my recent loss than I have ever been able myself to make. Reverses of this kind are but little of a trial to me; — my allotted temptations lying, not on the side of worldly anxiety and carefulness, but in the direction of a culpable negligence and indifference. And in this case, where the loss of money seems to be almost the gain of friends, I should indeed be Mammon's poorest bondslave, if every regret were not overpowered by thankfulness and trust of heart. . . . Nothing remarkable has occurred in the congregational way since your departure. Some people have taken the liberty to be born, to get married, to die, in your absence; — such human incidents, as of old, paying little respect to our clerical convenience, and reminding us that it is not they who serve us, but we that must serve them, — content to *take* the consecration which we seem to *give*. . . .

Rather a striking Circular has been issued by a body of Manchester ministers, summoning a Deliberative Convention of all Ministers of Religion, to consider the distress of the country, especially as consequent on the Corn Laws; *time*,

[1] In relation to a considerable loss of money.

middle of August. *This* and Dr. Hutton's Corn-law Sermon have led me to think a good deal about the duty of our order in relation to political action. The question is grave and difficult; but I think I have made up my mind that, *in our capacity of ministers,* we ought to stand aloof from all controversies, of which the *essence and subject-matter* do not lie within the province of religion and morals, — both sides of which equally admit of association with purity of devotion and the moral sense; and in which the sacred connexions are only the *subjective* relations to the special religion of the individual mind. A vague sort of test, you will say. — However, I conclude from it that, if I were in America, I could not be silent about *slavery;* and that, being in England, it is n't right to join in a *Sacred War* against *Sir Robert Peel and the Corn Laws.*

Nov. 24, 1843.

I should much like to confer with you about the prospects of the "Teacher," the decline of which I was no less surprised than grieved to learn. . . . I fear that the Unitarians don't want to learn any more; the idea of such a thing has become disagreeable to the bulk of them, and rather frightens them than otherwise; they think that, in a world so deplorably dark, they have, if anything, *too much* light, — not too little; and that till the poor mortals around us, delighting in farthing candles, have got pretty well used to gaslight, there is no occasion to seek the blessed sunshine. This spirit is against you, as it is against all that is best and noblest.

. . . . . .

I do trust that no false modesty will tempt you to let go your absolute control over the property and management of the periodical. I wish I were in a condition to place myself at your disposal as a coadjutor; but for some time longer at least I dare not enter into new obligations. Nevertheless, should you really be driven to meditate the abandonment of the undertaking, you would perhaps not object to our conferring together on the matter, before any definitive step is taken.

The Grange, near Keswick, July 10, 1847.

I feel ashamed to be so exceedingly grateful to you for your hint of release as to the "Prospective." I know how open I am to the reproach of idleness from my collaborateurs, and am seriously uneasy at my inefficiency. But, in truth, this country life, immediately following on long-sustained effort,

has fairly let me down; and to string myself up again requires a truly painful effort of will. . . . So be assured, you have seldom said a more comforting word (and that is a great thing to affirm) than when intimating that you could make up the needful quantity without me. As for *quality*, I only fear that the amount of pure quintessence of nutriment in preparation — Kenrick, Tayler, Newman, Thom — will want a little of my rubbish to make it digestible, — as hens eat gravel to grind down their grain.

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, Sept. 29, 1847.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — An irresistible desire has prevailed with me to connect this volume[1] with your name; and the inclosed copy will make confession to you of my presumption, — with humble looks deprecating your displeasure, and praying for a loving reception. Thoughts of you are entwined, in various indirect ways, with several of its portions; and there are probably few of its discourses that would not have been different, had I never known you. That such a mental relationship should be, and yet should give no signs, was a thing unnatural. May you find no serious occasion to be ashamed of me, as a country cousin, rudely taking your name in vain!

OCT. 10, 1847.

Though there were many things in your note that deeply touched me, and called forth an eager response, there was no reply that I could speak or write; so the occasion must pass, like many a sacred incident, with only a silent gratitude. That you are not displeased to have our names associated thus, and at all share my satisfaction in it, is a pure joy to me.

---

[1] The second volume of "Endeavours."

Chapter V

THE CONTINENT, 1848–1849

THE account of Mr. Martineau's residence abroad, with his family, may be given in the words of the Biographical Memoranda, but first one or two incidents which occurred during that time must be noticed. He had been scarcely a month abroad when his mother died. She had given her hearty approval and sympathy to the plan of a year's absence, and this plan had become, by the letting of Park Nook, unalterable before there was any ground of special anxiety on her account; but to be parted from her last hours was felt as a pathetic addition to the severance of so dear a tie. Her son thus refers to the event: —

"My mother had died during our absence. After long residence near us and my sisters' houses in Liverpool, she had removed to my brother Robert's in Birmingham, where, years before, she had undergone a fruitless operation for the restoration of sight, and where she was secure of the gentlest and most faithful care. Her many years of blindness she had borne with a patience little to be expected from a person of so much energy; yet without losing her activity of mind or contracting her circle of sympathies. She became conscious of failing strength before any marked decline was visible to others. Almost her last considerable act was one of the most delicate and fastidious honour, involving resolute and protracted self-denial, and touchingly expressive of her depth of affection and supreme sense of right."[1]

Soon afterwards he lost his aunt, Mary Rankin, of whom we have heard in connection with his childhood. We learn

[1] Bi. Mem.

about the same time that Miss Harriet Martineau was so far reconciled that Mrs. Martineau was once more in correspondence with her. Before the year abroad had expired it became evident that the opening of Hope Street Church must be postponed, as the building would not be complete; and accordingly the Chapel Committee passed a considerate resolution freeing their minister from any obligation to return before the middle of September.

In the following reminiscences of what Dr. Martineau calls his "Annus Mirabilis,"[1] the principal events have been checked, and a few dates added, from private letters written at the time.

"My plan was, to take the winter semester at Berlin; to prepare for it by some months' discipline in the language at Dresden; and to follow it up by successive residences in selected parts of Germany, long enough to allow of regular occupations, yet sufficiently varied to bring into view the main centres of interest in the country. Crossing with my family from Hull to Hamburgh in July, 1848, I proceeded by Brunswick to Dresden; and, establishing the household in a suite of rooms in the Waisenhaus Strasse, at once engaged masters and organised a regular scheme of life. The daily industry was relieved by all sorts of pleasant variations and interruptions; most frequently by visits to the Gallery and the Theatre (the Kapelle being under the direction of Reissiger and Wagner); occasionally by such excursions as the fine autumn weather invited, — now to the Plauensche Grund, and then to General Miltiz's at Meissen. Especially did we spend, under the guidance of our honoured friend, Dr. Krause, and in company with Miss Harriet Mill, and Mrs. Alexander Allen, and two English students, some delightful days in the Saxon Switzerland. The young men, Mr. John Tayler and Mr. Leyson Lewis, my son and I, quitting the party at Hirniskretschen, struck across Lausitz to Reichenbach; whence unfortunately Mr. Lewis was obliged, by a slight attack of illness, to return at once to Dresden. The rest of us, entering the forest and taking the Bohemian glass-works on the way, worked up the Western slopes of the Riesengebirge, and along their ridge,

[1] In a letter to Rev. C. Wicksteed, May 7, 1848.

with one foot, as it were, in Bohemia and the other in Silesia, till we reached the summit at the Schneekoppe. In spite of copious rain in the day, and fresh snow at night, the walk was magnificent; and its hardships added zest to its enjoyment. Stopping midway, drenched to the skin, at a little hospice in the mountains, we were persuaded to strip and hang up our clothes by the stoves to dry. The difficulty was, how meanwhile to dispose of our own persons, especially as we were ravenous, and had no idea of going to bed. But with a blanket and skewer apiece we got under cover, and sat, like a party of wild Indians, doing eager justice to the best of Weinsuppe and Forellen. I believe that a sketch of the scene, from the humourous pencil of our lost companion, still exists. But I must not indulge in these crowding recollections. The weather clearing, we descended, after exhausting the glories of the summit, on the picturesque Bohemian side, and made our way to Prague. That striking and interesting city bore at that time fresh traces of the insurrection recently suppressed; broken sculptures, balls embedded in the masonry of buildings, and the drawing-room window behind the curtain of which the General's wife was killed by a street shot, were pointed out to us; and an intense excitement, it was evident, still prevailed throughout the place. Returning by the Elbe to Dresden, we were relieved to find our invalided companion already convalescent.

"The Archduke John having been appointed Reichsverweser by the Frankfort Assembly, the troops of the different German States were required to take the oath of allegiance to him. This ceremony, impressive in its exterior, but reluctantly performed by King, Princes, and soldiers, we witnessed at Dresden. That it so soon lost its meaning marks the restlessness, at once ineffectual and dangerous, of that revolutionary year. When the time approached for our removal to Berlin, I took the precaution of writing for advice to the eminent Pastor Sydow, to whom I had letters of introduction. My fear that political agitation might make the capital of Prussia not the most eligible place for a winter of study, was confirmed by him; he dissuaded me from coming. Receiving, however, opposite counsel at the same time, I listened, by natural preference, to the opinion which fell in with all my arrangements, and, at the end of October, established my household in Berlin. Scarcely had we organised our habits and occupations there, and begun (my son Russell and I) our attendance at the University, when a domestic anxiety set in which made us little

sensible of the prevailing political alarms. Our eldest daughter was prostrated with nervous fever, the issue of which trembled for weeks between life and death; the danger being enhanced by brutal behaviour on the part of our landlord and his wife, which drove us from his house in the middle of the illness. At last, when she had been three weeks without closing her eyes and hope was almost gone, an experiment was tried which it terrified me to administer. After lifting her into a hot medicated bath, I poured, according to my instructions, an ice-cold douche from a considerable height on the crown of her head. The shock was severe and alarming; but, on being replaced in bed, she fell asleep; and from that time the constant strain was exchanged for alternations of repose with excitement gradually declining. It needed, however, all our five months' stay to restore her strength for our further journey.

"During the whole of this time, especially its earlier [? part], the struggle between the Court and the Revolution was passing through its most portentous phases. Berlin, when we arrived there, was under the protection of the National Guard, and at every public office might be seen a citizen in plain clothes, pacing to and fro with his Zündnadelgewehr on his shoulder; a promise having been extorted from the King that the soldiers should vacate the city and be kept at a distance from it. A Constitution was octroyirt, — a copy of which I bought in the street on the day of its issue and carefully studied. But scarcely was I master of my lesson, before it was recalled and replaced by another. A National Assembly was sitting in the Schauspielplatz, the left wing of which was led by an architect of the appropriate name of Unruh; and the discussions of which, though copious in patriotic eloquence, were concentrated upon no practicable objects. When Vienna was in revolution and invested by Windischgrätz for its suppression, a Resolution was brought forward in the Berlin Assembly, insisting that Prussian troops should be despatched to raise the siege and give ascendancy to the insurgents. To secure the passing of this Resolution, terrorism was applied to the members by the mob in the vestibule and around the house of the Assembly; and, in fear of their lives, some of the more obnoxious had to escape from the city. This was the turning point of the political drama. The King, changing his ministry, adopted two decisive measures. Declaring it proved that freedom of debate was impossible in presence of the Berlin populace, he adjourned the Assembly and summoned it to Brandenburg.

And seeing that the National Guard had shown itself incompetent to protect the peace of the city and the liberty of Parliament, he considered himself released from his engagement to dispense with the presence of the troops, and announced their return in a specified time. That time was adroitly anticipated; and as I was entering the Thiergarten on the previous day, I was turned back by the advance of immense bodies of infantry and cavalry, preceded by artillery ready for action. They secured the arsenal; they surrounded the Schauspielplatz, planting cannon at each corner; they mounted guard at the Palace and all the public places, without, however, dislodging the citizen sentinels already in duty there, or taking any notice of them. Next came a proclamation dissolving the National Guard and requiring the delivery of their arms. In conformity with a Resolution of the Officers, obedience was refused. To enforce it, the city was divided into sections; and small military parties were told off, to visit and, if necessary, search every house for the unsurrendered arms. No one expected that all this would pass off without conflict. The English Embassy, thinking seriously of the crisis, granted me an extra passport, in case flight should become necessary and the original one be irrecoverable from the Office of Police. And few persons who could help it ventured into the streets. There was a refractory portion of the Assembly which, denying the legality of the royal order, and refusing to go to Brandenburg, continued to meet in spite of frequent dispersion by force; and so long as this body held together, a nucleus existed which might at any time rally the revolutionary elements. But the vigilant promptitude of the government, the patience and good humour of the soldiers, together with the fortunate weakness of the democratic leaders, carried the reaction through without a barricade or a shot. The aspect of the city speedily changed. Carriages reappeared in the streets. Social visiting was resumed. Places of public amusement recovered their attractions. And the political tension, though still overstrained, permitted other interests to play their part again in life."

. . . . . .

"The long anxiety of illness at home and the troubled political weather abroad restricted our social experiences in Berlin. But it would be ungrateful not to record the friendly intercourse which we were privileged to enjoy with Dr. and Mrs. Pertz, Professor and Mrs. Ranke, Professor Trendelenburg and his family, Mr. and Mrs. Solly, Dr. and Mrs. Zumpt, and Professor and Mrs. Passow, who so far honoured us with

their confidence as to entrust their eldest daughter to us for a year's visit to England on our return. From among my son's friends also, and some former pupils of my own, — chiefly our Riesengebirge party, with Mr. Charles Beard and Mr. Richard Holt Hutton, who was under the same roof and daily dined with us, — we had a bright little inner circle around us, whose constant flow of kindly humour kept the outward clouds away, or touched them with some happy glow.

"Moving southward with the beginning of April, by Nürnberg and Bamberg, to Munich, and spending a week at each place of chief interest, we passed into the region of the 'Bavarian Alps'; settling ourselves for six weeks in a secularised monastery at St. Zeno near Reichenhall, till the snow should be sufficiently gone to open Berchtesgaden to us for the same length of time. The brilliant birth of the spring and the exuberant youth of the summer, as we pursued the year up the mountains, left an ineffaceable impression upon us all; nor did I ever expect, beyond the limits of Switzerland, to see the majestic and lovely elements of Alpine beauty so perfectly combined as they are in the country of the Königsee. Akin to it, yet inferior, is the interest of the Salzkammergut, which we next visited on our way to Passau. Taking there a private boat [July 2, 1849], we floated down the Danube, through solemn forests, and between ever-varying heights, to Linz; and then completed the journey to Vienna by steamer. No sooner had we landed than we found that the world was not as tranquil as it looked from our mountain retreats. On asking the landlord of the Römischer Kaiser whether he could receive us, he laughed and said that we might have the choice of all the rooms in all the hotels of the city. It was for Austria the most fearful hour of the Hungarian struggle. St. Stephen's tower was in military occupation, to keep perpetual outlook towards Pesth. The gaiety of Vienna was suspended. Strangers avoided, and even citizens deserted the place; and we were reminded on all hands that we were paying a hazardous visit. The calculation of time and probabilities, however, on which the venture had been made, was justified by the result. After successfully spending the allotted number of days and seeing all that we had proposed, we safely changed our quarters to the northern base of the Schneekoppe at Warmbrunn in Silesia, where we intended to remain for the last six weeks of our continental absence. Wooded hills and picturesque villages, rising out of a sea of waving corn, constitute a cheerful landscape around that

pleasant watering-place. The drawback is, or was, the painful poverty of the peasantry. With their farm industry they had combined the handloom linen weaving, and were suffering the wearisome process of inevitable defeat in the competition with machinery. The visible distress long haunted me; and, still more, the local indifference to its existence, and inattention to its cause.

"The new church at Liverpool not being finished at the promised date, I availed myself of my extended leave of absence to stay some time at Heidelberg, reaching it [August 29] by way of Eisenach, Fulda, and Frankfort, and so passing over the recent battle-field of the Baden insurrection. Heidelberg was in occupation of the Prussian troops; and soldiers were quartered in the rooms above our own. Unwelcome at first, they recommended themselves (we were assured) to the favour of the inhabitants by their steadiness and good temper, and [? helped] considerably to weaken the South German popular prejudice against the Prussians. A fortnight, diligently spent in exploring the delightful country of the Neckar, completed our term. We turned our faces homewards, and, pausing only at Bonn to visit some old friends, we hastened to Liverpool by Antwerp and Hull, and were again in Park Nook at the end of September." [Not later than the 19th.]

The journey from Antwerp to Hull was not without adventures. The regular passenger steamer was disabled; and, as Mr. Martineau's resources were nearly at an end, he found it impossible to remain any longer on the continent. Accordingly, he prevailed on the captain of the "Enterprise," a small fruit-boat, without passenger accommodation, to take the party on board. The voyage was rough, and the captain lost his bearings, and was unable to distinguish the lights. He was rescued from his peril by the knowledge of Mr. Martineau, who recognised the lights on the Norfolk coast; and at length they arrived safely at Hull, whence the family proceeded by train to Liverpool, reaching home on the evening of September 19.[1]

[1] The abstract of the letter from which these particulars are taken does not make it quite clear whether the arrival was on that precise day.

LETTERS, 1848, 1849

During Mr. Martineau's absence on the continent his review of the "Memoir and Papers of Dr. Channing," which he had prepared before leaving England, appeared, partly in the "Prospective," partly in the "Westminster Review."[1] It contains a fine appreciation of the great American preacher, by whom his own life had been not a little influenced, and presents a careful and discriminating analysis of his moral and intellectual qualities.

LETTERS, 1848 AND 1849

TO RICHARD HOLT HUTTON, ESQ.

WARMBRUNN, PRUS. SILESIA, Aug. 11, 1849.

MY DEAR RICHARD, — . . . Eagerly now do we count the time when more genial and human cares will succeed to this speculative world; and the image of our new Church and our old friends and our recovered home rises up before us by night and by day with increasing frequency. . . . How I shall contrive to get into harness again after being out at grass so long, I really cannot tell — except that it will be with hearty good will. I fear many of the difficulties which I felt in the old Chapel will remain difficulties still; though I am not without hope of effecting improvements in our organisation as a Christian Society. . . .

In a few days we begin our homeward move, though to be sure it is likely to be a somewhat circuitous one. The pacification of Baden has renewed our longing to see Heidelberg; and we think of setting out on Thursday for Eisenach and Frankfurt, where we may perhaps spend the day — the 28th — of the Goethe celebration (his hundredth birthday) in his native place, proceeding next day to Heidelberg. A fortnight we propose either to spend wholly there, or to divide with the neighbourhood of Bonn; and thence via Antwerp and Hull we hope to reach home by about the middle of September. At Coblenz we are to take up Miss Passow, who, to the great delight of all, especially Isabella, consents to spend the winter and

[1] Reprinted in Essays, Vol. I. The first part was in the August number of the "Prospective," 1848, and the second in the January number of the "Westminster," 1849. In the reprint they are combined into a single article.

spring with us. Our residence here has been very quiet and agreeable; but having pretty well exhausted the walks and excursions in the neighbourhood we shall not be sorry to change the scene. From the summit of the Schneekoppe we all took a parting survey, a few days ago, of the grand panorama of country around us — seeing from Tetschen to beyond Liebau, and having both the plain of Silesia and the mountains of Bohemia stretched as on a map beneath us. Basil, who has contracted a geographical enthusiasm from the study of Sydow's Atlas, was delighted, and pulled out his pocketbook to write down the names of all the mountains indicated by our guide. This ascent to the highest point in Germany, north of the Alps, closes our mountaineering life. Mr. and Mrs. Tayler, with John and Hannah, are now following pretty nearly in our steps among the Salzburg Alps, occupying probably the very residences we have left.

In a letter of Mr. Tayler's he speaks almost with enthusiasm of Mr. Newman's book,[1] and expresses his entire concurrence with its principles and their applications, except in some subordinate details. I was surprised at this, and think that I cannot have rightly apprehended Mr. Newman's scheme of religious thought. But I never met with such discrepant criticism as this book seems to have elicited, whence I infer that, at least, it is a *real* and *living* book. As the time for my return approaches I feel sensibly my Egyptian darkness as to all recent literature in England. You have doubtless noticed the sudden death, at Carlsbad, of the old Professor Zumpt — poor troubled soul — so his pain is over and his doubt is solved! I trust his daughters have the faith which he denied. I do not wonder at the influence which Schleiermacher exercised over the learned and thoughtful among his contemporaries. His Glaubenslehre, unsound as I think it is, is a wonderful structure, exhibiting a most singular combination of deep feeling and dialectic subtlety. And yet perhaps this combination is not singular in this country, though its appearance apart from any strong moral and imaginative elements is striking to the English observer. It is easier to do justice to Schleiermacher when one observes that there has been no one to take his place; that the last hope of mediation between philosophy and Christianity in Germany seems to have perished with him; and that the two great interests become daily more and more conscious of their mutual alienation.

[1] "The Soul."

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

DRESDEN, Oct. 21, 1848.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — The welcome sight of your handwriting, for which I have often longed during your foreign rambles, comes with double refreshment upon me in this strange exile; bringing before me, as no other influence could, the dear and sacred interests which re-engage you after your period of rest. During your absence I could trace your course but imperfectly; but I followed your return to Renshaw Street with constant thought, which I knew could not mislead; and now that I have heard from Richard Hutton a living report of your first days of resumed duty, I feel a double security and a more elastic spirit, in the enjoyment of my own opportunity of absence. Right heartily do we congratulate you both on the happy completion of your plan, and the domestication once more in the old scenes of labour, brightened, no doubt, and consecrated by the thousand pictures with which you can now compare them. When your letter came, I was roving over the summits of the Riesengebirge and amid the forests of Bohemia, else I would have replied sooner. Before breaking up our Saxon residence, I was anxious to quit the great cities, and see something of the physical and social aspect of the secluded interior, — to look at the Slavonic face and hear the Slavonic tongue, as well as to visit so venerable a city as Prague. The late and splendid autumn favoured an October excursion; and after accompanying our whole party, with some half dozen friends besides, through the Saxon Switzerland, I started, with Russell, and John Hutton Tayler, on a nine days' pedestrian tour through the mountain range which separates Prussian Silesia from Bohemia; crowning the enterprise by an ascent of the Schneekoppe, — the highest point between the Tyrol and Norway. Besides the invariable grandeurs of all vast mountain scenery, and the interest of drinking at their fountains the waters of the Iser and the Elbe, — the peculiar features of *forest scenery,* which were quite new to me, gave a special charm to the journey; I never knew before the *solitude,* — enough to take away one's breath, — in which upland wood and water sighing and singing in the winds could place one. The solemn, mystic spirit of the Teutonic mythology needs no other commentator than the voice of the pine mountain. It is on the Southern, or Bohemian, side that this wild character is principally found.

TO REV. J. H. THOM

Looking down on Silesia, from a height of five thousand feet, you see, beyond the middle ground of steep grass farms and deep ravines, a country undulating away into an immense plain, studded with towns, and coloured with the warm traces of human industry. In this contrast, as well as in everything else (except perhaps personal beauty), the superiority of the German to the Bohemian (Slavonic) race is very apparent; and it is impossible to cross, as we have done, from Adersbach to Prague, and live among the people for even a few days, without sympathising with the German anxiety lest the present condition of Austria should lead to any encroachment of Sclavish barbarism on Teutonic civilisation. . . .

Ever, my dear friend,

Your truly affectionate,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

13 BEHRER STRASSE, BERLIN, Feb. 25, 1849.

I have heard Neander lecture, though I have not met him in private. He often talks, I understand, about Blanco White; laments that Mr. White got into *the dead flat* of Liverpool Unitarianism; hopes that not many in England share your opinions, etc., etc.

His lectures are interesting from their matter, and the neatness approaching to elegance of expression, somewhat diffused, however, and delivered in a manner so peculiar as to defy conception. A little shy-looking man, with a quantity of black hair, and eyes so small and overshadowed by dark brows as to be invisible, slinks into a great lecture-room; steps up to his platform; but instead of taking his professor's chair, takes his station at the corner of his tall desk, leaning his arm upon the angle, and his head upon his arm; with his face thus hanging over the floor, and pulling a pen to pieces with his fingers, he begins to rock his desk backwards and forwards on its hind edge with every promise of a bouleversement, and talks smoothly, as he rocks, for his three-quarters of an hour, without a scrap of paper; quoting authorities, chapter and verse, and even citing and translating longish passages from ecclesiastical writers; and finishing every clause by spitting, in a quiet dropping way upon the floor, as if to express the punctuation. When the clock strikes, the demolition of the pen is just complete, and he slinks out of the room without apparently having once been conscious that anybody was present.

WARMBRUNN, July 29, 1849.

You have perhaps heard that we are summoned back, by the Committee, at the end of August. It grieves me unspeakably to contemplate the return, which would be a time of such natural joy and gratitude, — with any reluctance and regret; yet the prospect of this useless and characterless month, deprived both of the repose of preparation and the freshness of organised work, is distressing to me, and makes me look to its end with a kind of flat dread instead of with high hope. I have even thought that, in order to have some shelter from the exclusive pressure of secular and social claims, and to fix my mind upon its proper work, I should do well to have some preaching engagement at a sufficient distance; which would remove me from Liverpool on the Sundays, give my thoughts a point of union and collectedness, and enable me to begin the habits of my permanent life. A man without a shadow, or a lady without a centre of gravity, would not be more out of nature than I shall be for that anomalous month. The prospect of it has somewhat set me back, and I am less well than I have been; possibly to be so affected at all by things of this kind is itself an indication of imperfectly recovered strength; but I hope still for such temperate allowance of health as may serve the great working purposes of life. This year has been invaluable to me in many ways; and though it has not convinced me that my period of service is likely to be very protracted, it has enabled me to define more exactly my ideas of what may be attempted, and to improve in some degree my resources for the attempt; and it is something even to discover that one's power of real study and acquisition is not gone. I have felt exceedingly grateful to you for letting me alone in your capacity of Editor of the "Prospective," and so completing my holiday from home engagements. Had anything fallen in my way which would have presented suitable materials, I would have volunteered a contribution. But my studies have lain out of the course of our topics. I must endeavour to atone in some degree for my uselessness, as soon as my home life is brought once more into efficient order. But for a time I shall find myself quite out of my latitude on the sphere of English literature. The books that every one talks of and that I should have devoured at home — Macaulay, Morell, Froude, Newman — are still strange to me; and I have been living not only in a foreign country, but in every century rather than our own. — Your appreciating words respecting Mr. R. H. Hutton

delighted me, and convinced me that the affection with which I regard him does not deceive me. If his life is spared for an average period of service, I cannot help entertaining very high hopes of his beneficial influence intellectual and spiritual. Chiefly as an opening for this do I rejoice in the new honour which his recent examination has brought him. That he refers it in any degree to me is an amusing specimen of sophistical modesty. I have about as much to do with it as Tenterden steeple with Goodwin sands. It is pleasant, however, to be the object of even the illusory gratitude of a noble heart.

. . . . . .

In the region we are now in, English people are quite curiosities; and when recognised as not German, we are invariably taken either for *Bohemians* or for *Poles*, the two most familiar types of all outlandish qualities. It is in every way agreeable, however, to be out of the beaten track of our countrymen and surrounded by true German life; and we have selected all our resting-places with a regard to this. We shall have seen a vast deal more than I could have expected, — all the large capitals, almost every city of historical interest, all the great collections of works of art, the chief mountain ranges with their subjacent lakes and valleys, — the Elbe, the Danube, and perhaps the Rhine, through the whole length which presents any interest; yet, though the countries in which we have been seem never to have been free from political turmoil or actual war, we have been spared every un[?pleasantness] except during the November crisis in Berlin, — I am far from thinking, however, that the present restoration of order is permanent. If Austria were back again in the field of German politics, the chaos would reappear.

Chapter VI

HOPE STREET, 1849–1857

On his return from the continent, Mr. Martineau was looking forward with eager interest to the opening of the beautiful church which had been erected in Hope Street. Among the Protestant Dissenters, descendants of the English Presbyterians, accustomed to plain brick buildings, and the unadorned utility of a meeting-house, it was still something new to see a spire pointing heavenward, and the graces of Gothic architecture contributing to the outward dignity of public worship,[1] and some aged heads, full of the Puritan tradition, were shaken over this Romanising tendency. It was a more serious thing, as we shall see, that the awful and mysterious charge of "Germanising" was whispered, and afterwards loudly expressed, against the thoughtful and fearless preacher. For the moment, however, he was able to surrender himself undisturbed to the emotions which were awakened by the prospect of resuming his ministry under these improved conditions. The following letter to his friend, the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, gives us a glimpse of the hope, mingled with humble apprehensions, with which he contemplated a new period in his life:—

Herischdorf near Warmbrunn, Schlesien, Aug. 3. 1849.

My dear Wicksteed,—A small scrap of paper from a very distant place has, I am aware, the shabbiest of looks. But as Nature is said to blow thistle seeds across the Atlantic,

[1] The Chapel in Upper Brook Street, Manchester, had been already built, and mistaken by Mr. Henry Crabb Robinson for a "Popish Chapel."

HOPE STREET CHURCH, LIVERPOOL

Opened in the autumn of 1849

I will venture, as humble imitator, to commit my worthless weeds to wind and tide. In truth, I am so overjoyed to hear that my sensible people beg you to come to our aid at the opening of our new church, that I cannot refrain from a word of entreaty added to theirs. You cannot, however, I do believe, refuse us; the place of your first Ministry, and the abode of so many true friends, has claims upon a heart like yours not to be gainsaid. I can add nothing to them, or I would pray you to stand by me at a crisis which, as your recent experience will tell, needs every support which friendship and faith — the human stay united with the divine — can give. This return, under such new conditions, is in many respects a turning point in life with me; and with a nature that has in it more of resolve than of hope, I look on it with an awe which I would fain, by the presence of dear familiar faces, abate. So come, dear friend, and be my good angel. . . .

Ever affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

The day fixed for the opening of the church was Thursday, October 4; but, as the day approached, the unfinished state of the building rendered a postponement necessary, and it was not till Thursday, October 18, that the Rev. Thomas Madge, at the conclusion of the devotional service conducted by Mr. Martineau, preached the dedicatory sermon to a crowded congregation. The text was taken from Acts i. 13, 14, and furnished the theme for a sermon which, if not remarkable for originality of thought, was distinguished by the good sense and gentle piety, and rendered impressive by the silvery tones and unaffected delivery of the preacher. In the evening a meeting was held in the adjacent Hall of the Philharmonic Society, which was attended by about nine hundred persons. The great organ was played by Mr. Russell Martineau, and several speeches were delivered in the course of the evening. It is curious that the heading of the very full report of this meeting, contained in "The Christian Reformer," calls the new building "The Unitarian Church." Such an appellation

would never have been sanctioned by Mr. Martineau, the dream of whose life it was to have a church which rested on the unforced sympathies of Christian sentiment, and not on doctrinal distinctions; and in accordance with this view it was announced by Mr. Thomas Bolton, the chairman of the meeting, that the new church "had been registered as a place of meeting for Protestant Dissenters, for the public worship of Almighty God and instruction in the Christian Religion." In the course of the evening Mr. Madge spoke with generous appreciation of the great powers and endowments, and the devoted labours, of the Minister of the church, and of his own high regard for him, notwithstanding differences of opinion. The chairman proposed the sentiment: "The Reverend James Martineau, our highly respected and esteemed Friend and Minister; may the truth and warmth of our welcome on his return home be the measure of the benefit conferred by his absence upon him and his; and may our appreciation of the deep fervour of his religious services, and our admiration of the ability, fearlessness, eloquence, and usefulness of his most able discourses, be to him an abiding assurance that his labours among us are not in vain." Mr. Martineau, in his reply, spoke first of the delight of meeting his friends once more, and of the thousand things that crowded on his mind and heart, making the day one to be inscribed with a bright joy in the annals of his life. Then, remembering that it was a social occasion, he adopted a lighter strain, and evoked the laughter of his audience by his playful humour. Resuming his more serious tone, he spoke of his experiences in Germany, and declared that, while he had had much instruction, and was thankful for the great prospects which the last year had opened to him, he came home with a firm preference for our English social life, for our English modes of thought and habits of action, and especially for the popular and practical religion which existed in this

country, rather than that purely intellectual and critical theology which existed in Germany. Speaking of their prospects he expressed the hope that they might be able to find some machinery of administration with which they might more truly and faithfully realise the idea of a Christian Church. He was surprised at the way in which English society had run after the "Gospel of the Economists, which cries out 'Let a man help himself.'" "Help yourself" was the modern gospel of England, "Help one another" was the ancient gospel of the Christian Church; and he trusted to his congregation to see if they could find some method by which individual convictions might be brought to one common focus, so as to act, and kindle action in the world around.

Speeches were also delivered by Mr. Thomas Thornely, M.P., and Mr. James Heywood, M.P., who made the interesting announcement that he had "placed on the Notice-book of the House of Commons, a notice of his intention to move an Address to the Queen, praying her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission for inquiry into the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin," the object being to open these Universities to Dissenters without the imposition of doctrinal tests.[1] Among Mr. Martineau's ministerial friends the Revs. John Kenrick, Charles Wicksteed, J. H. Thom, and J. J. Tayler made appropriate speeches; and several other gentlemen, including Henry Crabb Robinson, having spoken, the proceedings of this eventful day closed about eleven o'clock. A few words of Mr. Tayler's may be quoted, as admirably expressing the catholic spirit which he so fondly cherished, and which was so fully exemplified in the Hope Street congregation: "He thought it honourable to the religious body with which he had the

[1] In Dublin the degrees, though not the Scholarships and Fellowships, were already open.

happiness to be connected, that it could harmoniously embrace within it elements of such various quality and apparently conflicting tendency, and without requiring any man to surrender his distinctive convictions, permit them all, of every shade of speculative opinion, to hold out to each other the right hand of Christian brotherhood, and to meet together with perfect cordiality and mutual respect, on the broad ground of Gospel love and human sympathy and philanthropic endeavour."

The following Sunday Mr. Martineau preached a sermon, published under the title of "The Watch-night Lamps," [1] in which he set forth his ideal of a Church. He began with solemn words of acknowledgment and greeting: "Now does the Heavenly Mercy rebuke all my fears. The long-imagined moment is really come: God restores us to each other. Beneath his eye we parted, and before his face we meet; and that Infinite Light scatters the lingering shadows of misgiving which have hung around the forecast of this hour. . . . I greet you with all the warmth of my affection and the fresh devotion of all my powers; consecrating myself and you to the service, not indeed of your will, — but of your faith and highest hope, your love and conscience, your remorse and aspiration, — which you know to be interpreters of a Will that must be monarch of your own." Speaking of vacancies, he misses "the dear and venerable form of one from whose eyes age had exhausted the vision but not the tears, and whose features were quickened and kindled by the light within." Then, assuming that a Church exists for public worship, he proposes to explain "what further may be the function of a Church, and ought to be the function of *this* Church, in the present age of the world." Adopting as his text, "The wise took oil in their

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV. On p. 450, line 12 from the bottom, there is a misprint, "eternal" instead of "internal," and p. 463, line 9 from the bottom, "eternal" should be "external."

vessels with their lamps," he allegorises the wise virgins into "the several Graces of the soul commissioned to wait upon their Lord," and represents these Graces as the Spirits of Endeavour, of Humiliation, of Trust, of Service, and of Communion. The ideas conveyed by these words are unfolded with a richness of thought and a splendour of language and imagery, which perhaps betray more than usual the labour of composition. A few of the thoughts may be very briefly indicated: "A Church is a fraternity . . . for realising the Christian life, creating the Christian mind, and guarding from deterioration the pure type of Christian perfection." "The moral law of God" is "the Rock on which we build" it. Nevertheless Christianity is not a "mere ethical system." When the voice of Christ has opened our spirit to the true nature of moral restraints and obligations, and "from utterances of human police they become tones, stealing through the foliage of the soul, from enshadowed oracles of God, their whole character and proportion are as much changed as if the dull guest had turned into an angel, and the stifling tent expanded to the midnight skies. . . . The feeling of duty, no longer negative, ceases to act like an external hindrance and prohibition, and becomes a positive internal power of endless aspiration. . . . To whomsoever God is Holy, to him is Duty Infinite." "He with whom God's presence has quieted a passion or subdued a grief is surprised by the nearness of his reality." "With a sentient nature that loves the *easiest,* and a conscience that reveres the *best,* we feel that Epicurus and Christ meet face to face within our soul." The place of mediation in religion is thus described: "There are two parts of our nature essential to our first approaches to God; the *Imagination* places him before us as an object of conception external to the mind; the *Conscience* interprets his personal relations of communion with ourselves. The first of these emphatically needs a mediator; the function of the

second perishes the moment he appears. We *cannot trust* the representative faculty of our nature whose pencil of design varies with the scope of Reason, and whose colours change with the moods and lights of Passion, to go direct to the sheet of Heaven, and show us the Almighty there: else, what watery ghost, or what glaring image, might we not have of the Eternal Providence? Only through what *has been* upon earth can we safely look to *what is* in heaven, through historical to divine perfection; and by keeping the eye intently fixed on the highest and most majestic forms in which living minds have ever actually revealed their thoughts and ways, we have a steady type, with hues that do not change or fly, of the great source of souls. Jesus of Nazareth, the centre of the scattered moral possibilities of history, is thus mediator to our imagination between God and man. On the other hand, we *cannot allow* the Conscience to resign for an instant its native right of immediate contact and audience with God: to delegate the privilege is treason; and to quit his eye is death." What is special to *this* Church is the belief that these five lamps, and these alone, are held in angel hands, and fed with the eternal aliment of truth. They come between Catholicism on the one side and a pantheistic Socialism on the other. "The venerable Genius of a *Divine Past* goes round with cowl and crozier. . . . The young Genius of a *Godless Future* . . . preaches the promise of a golden age, when priests and kings shall be hurled from their oppressive seat, and freed humanity, relieved from the incubus of worship, shall start itself to the proportions of a God. Who shall abide in peace the crash and conflict of this war? He only, I believe, whose allegiance is neither to the antiquated Past, nor to the speculative Future; but to the imperishable, the ever-present Soul of man as it is; who keeps close amid every change, to the reality of human nature which changes not; and who, following chiefly the revelations of the

Divine will to the open and conscious mind, and reading Scripture, history, and life, by their interpreting light, feels the serenity, and rests on the stability of God."

In the evening an excellent sermon was preached in Hope Street Church by the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, in which he showed, by a selection of representative men from various sects, that the essentials of Christianity were common to them all.

The general impression left upon Dr. Martineau's mind by the years at Hope Street may be given in the words of his Biographical Memoranda, in which, strangely enough, he makes no allusion to the great literary activity by which this period was marked: —

"With freshened heart I resumed my duties, both ministerial and academical. No revolution, however, had been wrought in me by the year of absence, and the new materials of thought and feeling which had accumulated silently flowed into the same channels of method which previous experience had traced. For eight years more I preached and lectured under conditions little varied. If there was any marked change, it was that I paid more assiduous attention to the instruction of the younger members of my congregation in historical and theological knowledge. Finding, for instance, that very confused ideas prevailed respecting the Communion Service, I thought it desirable to give a nine months' course of weekly evening lectures on the History of the Eucharist, its inner doctrine and its outer forms; and, at the end, to clear its permanent significance from all foreign accretions, and invite those of my hearers to whom that significance was dear to meet me for a short office of self-dedication (tantamount to Confirmation) prior to the next Communion. To avoid interference with the Sunday classes and services, these lectures were given on a week day.

"The later years of my College engagement at Manchester were deprived of one charm which had rendered the earlier ones memorable to me. Francis William Newman, who had been one of our professional staff from the first, had removed to University College, London; and his departure withdrew, not only from our class-rooms their most brilliant light, but from us his colleagues — especially from Mr. Tayler and my-

self — a personal friend for whom we had contracted a deep and even venerating affection. Though the change of religious opinion which was then going on in his mind was silently wrought out in his own study, and was not even known to us in its progress, yet it latently carried in it many sources of sympathy and lines of mental approach which, however little marked at the time, made themselves felt. When the extent of his change was avowed, it seemed to fix his theological position at a serious distance from ours, and to call in some of its relations for critical resistance, or at least some statement of the grounds of dissent. But the passages of controversy that took place between us in no way affected our friendship, the harmony of our sentiment and judgment being in truth vastly deeper than the difference. Even in regard to the most sensitive point for a Christian disciple — the estimate of the character of Jesus — it was obvious that the variance was one not of moral feeling, but of historical interpretation. The temper condemned by Mr. Newman was not that to which I gave my reverence; nor should I, had it stood before me, have directed on it any other sentiment than his. It was simply that we put a different construction on the biographical memorials preserved in the Gospels; or else that he continued to receive as historically true parts of those memorials which appeared, and still appear, to me fictitious accretions from the Apostolic or post-Apostolic age. The ideal life, of filial communion with God and trustful surrender to his righteous and loving will, remained the same to both; to him, a glorious possibility in the present and the future; to me, not without also representative in the past. If I cling to the historical element in Religion, it is because it embodies for me in concrete form the spiritually true and perfect. If he dispenses with it, it is to set free Divine and eternal relations from the accidents of time, the imperfections of men, and the uncertainties of tradition. In spite, therefore, of our position on opposite sides of the Christian name, the real affinity of thought could not fail to make itself felt. To his vigilant activity of mind, his readiness to start new questions, his fertility of suggestion, his self-forgetful courage in assailing questionable prejudices and habits, I am deeply grateful for many an awakening from my own more conservative tendency, opening my eyes to social errors and wrongs which I might not have noticed, and exhibiting remedies which at least demanded a careful estimate."

In relation to the classes for religious instruction, alluded to in the foregoing extract, the following more detailed account will be found interesting and suggestive. It is contained in a letter, of April 2, 1852, to Dr. W. B. Carpenter, who had evidently addressed to him some questions on the subject. The congregation referred to at the beginning was the one assembling at Rosslyn Hill Chapel, Hampstead.

"There cannot be any doubt that, in a congregation so rich as yours in intellectual resource, as well as in reliable zeal, a great deal might be efficiently done, without additional pressure upon the minister, for the religious instruction of the young people. The range of subjects susceptible of systematic religious treatment is so wide that, with only sufficient mutual understanding to avoid repetition and contradiction, each instructor might choose his work according to his particular taste and qualifications. Natural Theology, Moral Philosophy, Hebrew History, the Gospel narratives, the Pauline Christianity, the history of Christian doctrine, the distinctive peculiarities of the chief religions of the world, the application of Christianity to the present problems of society, — all afford abundant materials for the useful Sunday instruction of a class. I have always found it necessary to have *two* classes, — sometimes *three*. In the younger one, children from about nine to fifteen years old have been provided for; and the business of this class has always been *scriptural,* a Gospel being usually taken as the groundwork, and the requisite illustrative information, historical, geographical and chronological, being furnished orally, and prevented from escaping by frequent questions. The comparison of Gospel with Gospel brings out a good deal of useful remark; and when once the mental picture is clearly formed of the incident narrated, the apprehension of its moral and religious significance is readily given. I have once used Dr. H. Ware's 'Life of the Saviour,' but greatly prefer the direct employment of the Scriptures. I need not say that the constant use of maps and engravings for illustration, as well as of historical tables, adds an essential value to the lessons. I have always had this younger class immediately after the morning service for about forty or forty-five minutes.

"The young people of more advanced age (no limit being

fixed at the upper end) require to be divided according to sex, if the work on which they are engaged requires oral examination; otherwise they are not free and open in their answers. I have conducted classes in this way through Milman's 'History of the Jews'; his 'History of Christianity'; Butler's 'Analogy'; Channing's 'Discourses on the Evidences'; and other standard works. But the difficulty of finding *separate* hours convenient respectively for the young women and for the young men has induced me of late to unite them in one class, and consequently to abandon the examination and substitute a *Lecture*, with references to books, and, when the class is not too numerous, personal correction of the notes made by the hearers of the lecture. When the young people have reached the age for this senior class, they have usually become serious and reflective, and are trying their deeper powers of thought upon the greatest themes of religion. The most seasonable guidance is accordingly rendered to them by treating of the ultimate grounds of faith, and dealing with the questions included in the 'Theory of Religion.' Systematic courses on natural Morals and Faith — with critical Reviews of different schemes of doctrine on these subjects — I have found to be apparently the most useful; and I have the more readily taken up this class of topics because the more advanced *Scriptural* studies are separately provided for by a Sunday Lecture given, to an audience of various ages, an hour before the Morning Service. The senior class used to meet me on Sunday afternoon; but the claims of our Sunday Schools now interfere with this arrangement, and we assemble at Five o'clock every *Wednesday* afternoon. The two classes comprise from sixty to seventy young persons. Though I have continued these plans during the greater part of my residence here, I am often tempted, in moments of depression, to doubt whether they effect the good I could desire. The disappointments connected with them are not few. Yet I have never suspended them for a time without becoming convinced that, if their existence be a dubious good, their non-existence is a certain evil;—a conclusion which perhaps expresses pretty nearly the result of all one's experience of effort;—it is reserved for God to do all the good; it is enough for us to stop a portion of the evil."

These classes for members of his congregation did not exhaust Mr. Martineau's energy or his sense of ministerial duty. There were elementary day-schools connected with

his congregation, and in these the task of united religious education, conducted by himself or under his direction, was successfully achieved. An account of this is given in a letter to Mr. Edward Enfield, Feb. 22, 1860: —

"The religious instruction in our Liverpool day-schools, not being predetermined by any Rules in the Constitution, varied in its methods from time to time. School was opened in the morning, and closed in the afternoon by a short prayer and hymn; — always the latter; though there were periods when the former, from deference to Catholic scruples, was omitted.

"For most of the years of my Liverpool life it was my practice to take a Bible Class in each school (Boys and Girls) once a week at least, sometimes twice; and the lessons given involved for the children a preparation which furnished similar work with the Master and Mistress on the other days of the week, or at least on some of them. This arrangement, however, affected only the two highest classes (combined for the purpose) in each school; and the religious instruction of the others was left to the discretion of the Master and Mistress, except so far as the reading-lessons carried in them more or less provision for the want.

"Latterly, under Inspection, our paid Teachers became so much more competent to the conduct of classes than any volunteer visitors, that the system of direct teaching by the latter was greatly reduced; and instead of it, a general superintendence only was given to the instruction as imparted by the Master, Mistress, and Pupil Teachers, and the results tested by occasional examination. Under increasing pressure of occupation I allowed this change to take place in the Bible classes as well as in the others; and I do not think they suffered by it. I kept my eye upon what was going on, and knew that all was right. But though our local circumstances and excellent *personnel* rendered this reduced amount of attention sufficient, I do not approve of it as a system; and we had begun to retrace our steps to the old method before I left Liverpool. The Bible classes were held within the regular School hours; and we never had the slightest objection raised to the union of all the children in it. I greatly doubt the wisdom of making rules of exemption, in anticipation of possible scruples. Had such scruples arisen, I should have dealt with them quietly, so as to meet the individual case; but as they were not presupposed and asked for, they never appeared; and I had Catholics and

Protestants, Church and Dissenters, Independents and Unitarians, in the classes together, and never the whisper of a difficulty. Yet we never had more than four or five per cent of the children from our own religious body.

"A very large proportion of the Day School children came also to the Sunday School, and had thus extended and special opportunities of religious instruction.

"So far as our system worked well, — and the results were such as to give the schools the best reputation, — I think we owe it to the flexibility of our methods and the absence of rigid predetermination by rules."

In his literary work he was assisted by Mrs. Martineau, who was always ready to slip into his study when he wanted to read to her passages or whole articles on which he desired to hear her views. He could not bear having anything printed before she had approved the contents. His sensitive and finely strung nature was helped by her quick perceptions and sound common-sense, which were balanced by deep and vivid emotions.[1]

In February, 1850, Mr. Martineau lost a beloved sister, Mrs. Greenhow, of Newcastle-on-Tyne. Though he had been in some measure prepared by accounts of her failing strength, her death was unexpected; and he rose from several days' confinement in bed with a cold in his throat, not to see her for the last time on earth, but to attend her funeral. He was joined by his brother, Mr. Robert Martineau; and on their return journey they spent a day with their sister Harriet at the Knoll at Ambleside. On this occasion he embraced the opportunity of calling on Mrs. Arnold at Fox How.

In the spring he accepted an invitation to preach in Dublin. He was cordially welcomed by old friends, and some who were familiar with the tradition of his name then saw and heard him for the first time, and received his

[1] From a letter lately received from a friend who was at that time intimate with the family.

kindly greeting after the service. Coming straight from his beautiful new church, he was naturally struck with the dingy and untidy look of the old Chapel where he had begun his ministry.

At this time the Church of England was profoundly agitated by the Gorham controversy. Dr. Phillpotts, the Bishop of Exeter, refused to institute Mr. Gorham into a living to which he had been presented by the Lord Chancellor, on the ground that he did not hold the Church doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Mr. Gorham appealed to the law, and in 1849 the Dean of Arches Court pronounced against him, to the great satisfaction of the High Church party. He appealed, however, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the judgment of the lower Court was reversed, on the ground that many eminent prelates and divines had maintained opinions like Mr. Gorham's without censure. It was now the turn of the Evangelicals to exult, while their opponents bewailed their subjection to a secular tribunal. Mr. Martineau took advantage of these events to write for the April number of the "Westminster Review," 1850, a long and elaborate article on "The Church of England," [1] in which he endeavoured to lift the whole controversy to higher ground, and to point out how far the Church was at that time from fulfilling its duties as a national institution. After a humorous description of the attitude of Englishmen towards law and theology, and their contentment with practical results, he remarks: "The decisions in the Articles may be stringent, the pretensions of the Ordination-service arrogant, and the imprecations of the Creed unflinching; but while they are not pressed into any visible form of ecclesiastical action, the persons of a few mild and charitable Bishops suffice to counteract their effect, and to persuade men, fresh from the very sound

[1] Reprinted in Miscellanies, and in Essays, II.

of her anathemas, that they belong to the most liberal of Churches." But in the last fifteen years a new spirit had grown up, and the boast of variety was exchanged for pretensions to unity, and the widest differences co-existed only till one class was strong enough to expel the other. The result among the educated laity was one of utter disgust at both parties; "of amazement to find themselves thrown back upon the scholastic jargon of the Middle Ages, and into the dreams of an unawakened civilisation; of shame at the utter unreality, the emptiness, the cold distance from nature and life, of the tenets said to constitute the religion of this nation." This was a question in which every Englishman had an interest; for already the demand was being raised that the whole education of the country should be delivered into the hands of the clergy, and that the Church, while retaining its dignity and power as a State institution, should be free from the control of Parliament. In a private sect any amount of sacerdotal arrogance would be allowable; but a Church which claimed to be national should teach the religion of the nation, and this the Church of England had ceased to do. "Recent events . . . have awakened thousands to the consciousness of an alarming interval between the dogmatic system of the Church and the living spirit of the time; and for one who refers this to the degeneracy of the age, there are a hundred who regard it as a superannuation of the Church." This recoil from the forms of the old orthodoxy was not the result of a light and audacious spirit, but sprang, in a large class of cases, from a profound moral earnestness. "Religion, like poetry, is a life, a spirit, that must find its own forms by development from within, and cannot be moulded by external constriction; and the larger freedom you have courage to allow, the less will you have to regret irregularity and distortion; for it has inherently a tendency to order and beauty, only determined, not by authoritative mechanism, but by the rhythm and sym-

metry of the affections themselves." On the other hand, "divisions without end, and passions without check, have been the invariable result of ecclesiastical legislation for unity and peace. It brings with it strong delusion and a corrupting poison into the clerical mind; bewildering its perception of the proportions of things, and confounding the solemn and the frivolous; where mystery is deepest, raising highest the conceit of knowledge; where forbearance is most due, removing all restraints from anger; where penalty can least avail, applying it with cruellest force; substituting the pleader's arts for the disciple's simplicity, and the sophist's pride for the saint's meekness. The organisation of dogma is symptomatic of the dissolution of faith; it is an unwholesome mushroom growth from the rotting leaves now fallen from the tree of life." There was a large and increasing class of doubting and dissatisfied Churchmen. They felt that the forensic scheme of vicarious atonement was at variance with the habitual moral sentiments of men, and "that to accept the offer of such a doctrine would be unworthy of a noble heart: for he who would not rather be damned than escape through the sufferings of innocence and sanctity is so far from the qualifications of a saint, that he has not even the magnanimity of Milton's fiends." Hence the doctrine of reserve, the *Disciplina Arcani,* was gaining favour with Tractarian leaders. But "the guilt and discredit of artifice are spent only in the purchase of failure. . . . The shadow on the dial of history cannot be coaxed back." The devout layman and the devout ecclesiastic differed in their moral tastes and standard, and the state of mind extolled as spiritual was felt to be only ecclesiastical. This alienation of national intelligence and piety from the Church was not wonderful; for the Anglican and Evangelical systems were made up in the fourth and the sixteenth centuries, and no change had found admission since. But the progress of science had

completely altered our picture of the Universe; and the Articles of the Church contained metaphysical propositions, historical judgments, and verdicts of literary criticism, which it was no longer possible to accept. These changes were patent to all the world, and placed the educated laity in the most dangerous of all positions, — a position *above* the faith which they professed, so that they patronised where they should have adored. It was the duty of the State, then, to make provision for variety, and for a gradual enlargement of the terms of communion, and not permanently leave the Churches of our forefathers "to the sort of teachers who are now wearying the world with their puerilities, and shocking it with their intolerance."

In the same year a startling illustration of the estrangement of many educated and religious laymen from the teaching of the Church was afforded by the publication of Mr. F. W. Newman's "Phases of Faith." As we have seen, Mr. Martineau and Mr. Newman had been associated as professors at Manchester New College, and had contracted a warm mutual friendship; and it was accordingly not without personal pain that the former observed the destructive character of the conclusions which Mr. Newman had reached, and the necessary loss of his sympathy in cherished persuasions. Their main divergence was in their estimate of the character and historical position of Christ. To the end of his life Mr. Martineau retained the profoundest veneration for Christ, and the attitude of a disciple towards him; and though he has been accused of "destructive criticism," his aim was always to destroy the lower in order to preserve the higher, and by a just historical method to clear away the accretions which obscured or distorted that grand and unique personality. His friend's depreciating views, therefore, touched him in a very tender point; and it shows the sincerity of his attachment to the principles of religious liberty that, instead of resorting to reproach or

alienation, he stated calmly, yet forcibly, the grounds of his dissent from the views, and retained his friendship for the man. His luminous criticism of the book appeared in the "Prospective Review" for August,[1] and is of great value as indicating the position which he then occupied in relation to Christianity and its records. That position must have seemed at the time to be a very advanced one, and the principles are clearly enunciated which he carried out more fully in later life. The earlier part of the review deals with the personal characteristics of the writer, and points out the difference between the Catholic and Evangelical temperaments: "The Evangelical lives wholly in the spiritual as incompatible with the natural; the Catholic seeks to subjugate the natural (as he conceives God does) by interpenetration of the spiritual." The former type of thought is defective in the imaginative faculty, and totally separates the real from the ideal, whereas the Catholic "detects the ideal *in* the real, and, like a golden sunset on the smoke-cloud of a city, glorifies the very soil of earth with heavenly light." To this characteristic must be attributed especially the author's impatience at the historical details of the life of Christ. After sketching Mr. Newman's changes of thought, the review proceeds to criticise his attitude towards Christianity. The principle on which this criticism is based is found in Mr. Martineau's view of revelation: "That Revelation can be made only in the shape of orders imposed upon the will, or information communicated to the understanding, is a postulate which we cannot allow. God may speak to us, — in preternatural as in natural providence, — through our moral perceptions and affections, — according to the manner of Art, by creation of spiritual Beauty, rather than after the type of Science, by logical delivery of truth. In this case, all that can be required of the vehicle

[1] Reprinted in Miscellanies, and in Essays, III.

is, that it be an adequate and preservative framework for the Divine image presented before the human soul. In the Gospels, taken with relation to the Pauline writings, this requisition appears to us fully met. Whatever uncertainty there may be, in this or that detail, as to what Christ *did,* there is surely no reasonable doubt as to what he *was;* and if this be left, then, so far from all being lost, the essential power of the Christian religion is permanently safe." Revelation of this kind is compatible with "such fallibility in matters of intellectual and literary estimate, as every theory must allow which leaves to the inspired prophet any human faculties at all, or any means of contact with the mind of his age and nation." On this ground it is maintained that, though the claim to be the expected Jewish Messiah had no basis in reality, it was not indicative of any moral imperfection; for "due allowance" must be "made for the vague and ambiguous meaning of the word 'Messiah.'" The theocratic faith had its religious side, "intent upon the realisation of a spiritual Ideal"; and if Jesus never positively denied the political functions of Messiah, an infallible moral perception detained him from every tendency to realise them.

In his criticism of doctrine Mr. Newman objected especially to the theory that the Christian "religion is embodied in the Life and Spirit of Christ, who is a perfect man and the moral image of God." In vindicating this position the reviewer maintains that the literary problem is so simple as to leave no serious uncertainty; that, in any case, "the Divine Image furnished by the life of Christ is now secured to the soul of Christendom, — presides in secret over its moral estimates, directs its aspirations, and inspires its worship," and the established power of a soul over multitudes of others must enter as an element into our veneration; and, finally, that, as "all souls are of one species: or rather, are lifted above the level where diversity of species prevails,

so as to range, not with Nature, but with God," Christ's humanity is not in itself any evidence of moral imperfection. He agrees, indeed, with Mr. Newman "in rejecting all notion of an absolute oracle, to whose *dicta* we are submissively to bow"; but then "sinlessness of Conscience does not require Omniscience in the Understanding." At the close of the article he defends the beneficent agency of Christianity in the course of its history, especially as affecting the condition of women, slavery, and the Reformation. The review concludes as follows: "If it hath pleased God the Creator to fit up one system with one Sun, to make the delight of several worlds; so may it fitly have pleased God the Revealer to kindle amid the ecliptic of history One Divine Soul, to glorify whatever lies within the great year of his moral Providence, and represent the Father of Lights. The exhibition of Christ as his Moral Image has maintained in the souls of men a common spiritual type to correct the aberrations of their individuality, to unite the humblest and the highest, to merge all minds into one family, — and *that* the family of God."

Though it is anticipating a few years, it seems best to refer here to the review of the second edition of the "Phases of Faith," which appeared in 1853. This review is in the main a reply to one of Mr. Newman's additional chapters, in which he elaborates his argument against the moral perfection of Christ. Mr. Martineau still rests his Christianity on that moral perfection, and in the holiest elements of his conception of God traces lineaments of that Historic Person. He maintains that moral perfection consists in entire fidelity to a trust, and that therefore a hyperphysical nature or endowment is not an indispensable condition of a sinless life. "Were Christ's immaculate excellence attained on these exceptional conditions, not only would it fail to impose, but it would actually disprove, any obligation in us to be like him." He then guards him-

self against a misapprehension of this view: "Of *Absolute* excellence, as of absolute power and wisdom, though they be objects of necessary belief as predicates of the Most High, we can form no positive conception; but the Moral Perfection which we attribute to Christ *is* most distinctly conceivable: we read it off at once from the portraiture of the Gospels; it is simply the beauty of holiness which we see in the image there; and we only say: 'This, of all historical realisations, is morally the highest; and having gazed on him, we shall henceforth know better what Divine goodness is, and see in the Supreme Heaven and Infinite Archetype of all, a tender depth and a speaking look we had not discerned before.'" To the objection that there was an arrogant tone in Christ's Messianic claims, Mr. Martineau accepts in part the answer that he *had* all these prerogatives, and it was only truth and necessity to claim them; but he qualifies this acceptance by the statement of his conviction "that our present Gospels exhibit this oracular and Messianic character of Christ's teaching in great excess of the reality." Other objections of Mr. Newman's are examined with great care, though appearing to the reviewer to rest on very eccentric readings of the evangelical history. At the close Mr. Martineau reiterates his conviction that "notwithstanding the imperfect medium through which we contemplate the author of our religion, the image is clearly discernible of a most powerful and holy individuality, harmonising opposite tendencies, balancing the affinities between earth and heaven, rich in compassion for suffering and indignation at wrong, denying to self and in close communion with God, and inspired at once to teach the deepest truths of faith and personate the purest elements of goodness."

A short article in the "Prospective Review" for May, 1850, exposes the weakness and inconsistency of a discourse by Dr. Robert Vaughan on "Letter and Spirit";

but Mr. Martineau does not attempt himself "to lay out systematically the great subject of which he treats." [1]

In 1850 England was seized with one of those fits of excitement to which the staid English nation seems curiously liable. The cry of "No Popery" rang through the land; for a "Papal Aggression" had been made, and the Pope had dared to appoint Catholic Bishops to English sees. The horror spent itself in the futile "Ecclesiastical Titles Act," passed in the following year, and the country once more breathed freely. While the national indignation was at its height, and before parliamentary action was taken, Mr. Martineau wrote, for the January number of the "Westminster Review," 1851, a long and careful article, entitled "The Battle of the Churches." [2] It begins with a caustic allusion to Comte's "grand law of human progression," which stood aghast at the prevailing excitement. It then enters on the main subject, the relation between sacerdotal claims and the rights of the State. Mr. Martineau, in contrast with the popular view, does full justice to "the depth and solidity of the Catholic dogma, its wide and various adaptation to wants ineffaceable from the human heart, its wonderful fusion of the supernatural into the natural life, its vast resources for a powerful hold upon the conscience." He accordingly anticipates further progress in the Roman Catholic reaction; and, while pleading that nothing illegal has been done, admits that there is some just ground for the suspicion that a step made good by the Papal hierarchy introduces an unsound element into English life. The reason is that Catholicism differs from ordinary Dissent in being a polity, which claims to rest on supernatural sanctions, and therefore to be intrinsically superior to the State. Hence it is that it cannot co-exist tranquilly with English institutions; "that every step it

[1] Reprinted in Essays, II.

[2] Reprinted in Miscellanies, and in Essays, II.

may make is an encroachment upon wholesome liberty; that it is innocent only where it is insignificant, and where it is ascendant will neither part with power nor use it well." Nevertheless Catholic Emancipation was given with full knowledge of the claims of Rome; the new hierarchy is not illegal; and the advice which Mr. Martineau delivered to his fellow countrymen is, "Be just, and fear not; put not your trust in coercive laws; dream not that divine truth can be bought with the coin of human injury; be resolved, if ever you have to defend your own rights from encroachment, to enter the field without reproach." He thinks, however, that the outcry was a proof, not of the Protestant, but of the sacerdotal spirit of the English establishment; "the anger of the clergy arises from their holding the very same doctrine as their opponents; viz., that on the same spot there cannot be more than one bishop," having exclusive possession of all the means of grace, the sole power of transmitting the Holy Spirit. He concludes, therefore, that "the malady, by becoming insular instead of continental, does not abate its danger. In every form and in every degree, mediatorial persons entrusted with mediatorial substances, and standing with supernatural incantations between man and God, are perilous to the well-being of the State. They occupy a position above the law; they constitute a polity distinct from the civil organisation, and are never content till it is subordinated to their ends." He then contends that the sacramental and priestly doctrine of the Anglican movement is authorised by the formularies of the Church; and he thus expresses his opinion of the Anglican clergy: "We believe them to be the most pernicious men of all within the compass of the Church; but also the most sincere, the most learned, the most self-denying; the most faithful, intellectually and morally, to the ecclesiastical training which has been provided for them." The Act of Uniformity, by enforcing a hetero-

geneous congeries of theological propositions with no organic unity, has rendered absurd, though it has not abolished, the pretence of a supernatural trust of dogma in the keeping of our ecclesiastics; and this hollow profession of an unreal unity has a most unfavourable influence on the character and culture of the clergy, producing a haughty ignorance of Nonconformity, a perversion of history, and opposition to the characteristics of the age and to every social improvement. The sacerdotal character of the Church, whether the claim be true or false, disqualifies it for recognition as *the* establishment in a nation of mixed religions. Politicians like the "compromise" of the prayer-book; but, though there may be compromise in matters of external action, there can be none in the profession of conviction, and it is impossible to assent at the same time to the Catholic and Calvinistic schemes without unveracity. "It is now too late to sound the praises of compromise; when once it has become detected inconsistency, its charm and power are gone; it fascinates only the sceptic contemner of mankind; it repels the truthful and the noble." "Never was incompetency proved on a scale so gigantic; never was pretence more preposterous than that of the Church to unite believers of every shade, — with a third of the religious English Dissenters, and a third of the Empire Catholics!" Thus the Church, as at present constituted, is disqualified for holding a national position. There are but two ways in which the State can recognise the religion which has living possession of the mind of the nation: "Either the strongest of the actual sects may be taken as expressive of the general will, to the exclusion of all the rest; or they may be all assumed as partial declarations of national faith, to which, as a whole, no one of them is competent to give complete expression." The first method would be regarded as unjust, and the second is the true exponent of the present facts of society. This would re-

quire some range to be left in every service for the free ministrations of the clergyman, and the allowing to congregations a voice in the appointment of their ministers. Mr. Martineau confesses, however, to a doubt whether such a plan of comprehension is not too late; and he suggests an ecclesiastical partnership, in which parishes might choose ministers who had not received episcopal ordination, but had won a University degree, and been recognised according to the usages of some denomination known to the law. The essay, as a whole, shows that, while he had no sympathy with the principles of the British Anti-State Church Association, as the Liberation Society was then called, he was convinced that the position of the existing State Church was indefensible.

To some extent the same subject is treated in the article on "Europe since the Reformation," contributed to the "Prospective Review," February, 1851.[1] This article is a controversial review of J. H. Newman's "Lectures on Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church." It gives a splendid picture of Catholicism in its long struggle with inferior religions, and then examines at length its contrast with Protestantism in fostering the best fruits of civilisation. It reaches the conclusion that God "has pronounced that Sacerdotalism must cease to rule, and go out at the lower end of human life." But the writer admits "that the theory of individual independence has been carried to a vicious extreme, and that the authority of the State must be extended over a wider range than the severity of economic doctrine has been willing to allow; concerning itself again, with the houses, the hours, the education, the amusements of the people." Finally, he protests against the unworthy consternation into which England had been thrown, and deprecates resort to "the stained and discarded weapons of law."

[1] Reprinted in Essays, II.

The Dean of Bristol, the Very Rev. Dr. Gilbert Elliot, on perusing the former of these articles, sent the reviewer a volume, accompanied by a short note, in which he says that he thinks "the Church of England scarcely speaks with so uncertain a voice as is generally attributed to it." The following is Mr. Martineau's reply: —

(*Rough copy in shorthand of a reply to the Dean of Bristol's letter of Jan.* 31, 1851.)

Very Rev. Sir, — I beg to tender my sincere thanks for the opportunity you have afforded me of learning, from your sermons as well as from your speeches (which I had read with delight), your sentiments in relation to the present ecclesiastical crisis. If every clergyman possessed your clear apprehension of the Protestant as opposed to the sacerdotal principle, and your generous attachment to it, there would be no necessity for drawing attention to those elements in the Prayer-book which are at variance with it, and which have enabled the Tractarians to gain so mischievous a success. That the articles from which you reason in the fifth sermon bear out your conclusion as to the character and teaching of the Church, I freely admit; but the question remains whether the offices for the visitation of the sick, for baptism, for the communion, for ordination and consecration, as well as the catechism, and the rubrics, do not bear out just the opposite conclusion. To me it appears that anyone attempting to explain away the traces of a "sacramental system" in these formularies could only do it by a sophistry as deplorable as that of Tract 90. That the word *Priest* in particular is to be understood in its full sense seems especially manifest from the whole tenor of the Communion Service; and it is a significant fact that in Dupont's Greek version of the Prayer-book the word ἱερεὺς (everywhere denied in the New Testament except to our Lord in heaven) is throughout employed to denote the officiating clergyman, who, in your view, is but a πρεσβύτερος. I am very far, however, from doubting that, by some mode of thought sufficient to satisfy the conscience of a faithful Christian, you contrive to harmonise and hold *ex animo* the doctrinal elements which to a less refined ingenuity appear so hard to reconcile.

But why should *ingenuity* at all be required in order to give unity to the teachings of a Church? Surely there is no difficulty, where there is a heart of Christian simplicity, in speaking

with a plain consistency, which shall leave no excuse for self-sophistication. It is truly gratifying to learn your opinion, that this should be done within the Prayer-book, as well as in the pulpit. To restore internal consistency is necessary to the Church regarded merely as a Christian *sect* which has fallen into divisions. Much greater alterations, a much wider dogmatic latitude, would be required, in order to secure again to the Church its grand function of truly uttering the great heart of the nation.

Would that the holy Spirit of God might put it into the soul of some noble band of men, as earnest, as powerful, as English-hearted as yourself, to attempt a reform large enough to restore spiritual unity to our disintegrated people and power to our enfeebled Christianity.

Forgive this prayer, if it be too bold. It is at least ardent and disinterested.

Ever yours faithfully,
The writer of the article in "Westminster Review" on the "Battle of the Churches."

We come now to a very painful episode. Early in 1851 a volume was published with the title, "Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development. By Henry George Atkinson, F.G.S. and Harriet Martineau." The main thesis of the volume, if it can be said to have a main thesis, is that mental science should be studied through phrenology, and that phrenology should be studied chiefly through mesmerism. Miss Martineau plays, generally speaking, the part of submissive disciple, proposing questions, and expressing her rapture at the answers. The pupil, however, outstrips the master in her denials. She gently reproves him for using the word God: "Pray tell me, too, whether, in this last letter, you do not, in speaking of God, use merely another name for law? We know nothing beyond law, do we?"[1] Mr. Atkinson feebly apologises: "We assume a something and a principle, because the form of mind requires it, as a thing essential, though unknown; and it is this which I wrongly enough perhaps termed God."[2]

[1] P. 164.

[2] P. 170.

The book, notwithstanding its scorn of "responsibility," [1] and its treatment of the Christian religion as "an old wife's fable," [2] has a high moral tone breathing through it, and earnestly maintains the right of free thought and honest expression. After the lapse of half a century Mr. Atkinson is unknown to the world of thought, and, had it not been for the sanction of Miss Martineau's distinguished name, it is hard to believe that, in spite of some excellent reflections, his dreary and sometimes incoherent declamation, pretentious dogmatism, abuse of other people's belief, and questionable science, would have attracted any attention. How Miss Martineau came to rate him so highly does not concern our present narrative. By the beginning of March Mr. Martineau was forming his estimate of this work, which must have been to him profoundly painful; for it showed that his sister had passed into another world of thought, and regarded with contempt those great spiritual beliefs which in earlier times had been the strongest bond of affection and sympathy between them. In the next number of the "Prospective Review" appeared, under the title of "Mesmeric Atheism," what must be characterised as a scathing notice of the Letters, and it may be questioned whether it would not have been better to allow them to die of their own insignificance. No impartial reader can wonder that Miss Harriet Martineau was pained by this review, however sad it is that it should have permanently alienated her from her brother. She might at least have remembered in palliation of its severity that the book spoke of his profoundest convictions with the most lofty contempt. This estrangement on the part of his sister, and the later misrepresentations circulated by her injudicious friends, deeply wounded him, and he thought it right to place on record, in his Biographical Memoranda, his recollection of the circumstances. In

[1] P. 131. [2] P. 239.

a letter to the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, Aug. 5, 1877, he says: "As these passages of my life are really important as features or crises in it, it would be in me an artificial suppression if, — just because others have made them the occasion of unfavourable remark, — I avoided all reference to them; this would in fact be tantamount to an admission that the representations already made were correct. And *if* I notice these incidents, it is now no longer possible to treat them without any reference to what has been said about them." In justice, then, to Dr. Martineau, the account referred to in these words is here printed in full: —

"Before I take leave of the 'Prospective,' I ought perhaps to advert to one article in it which, from its sad consequences, forms an epoch in my life. I refer to the review, in May, 1851, of my sister Harriet's and Mr. Atkinson's 'Letters on Man's Nature and Development.' In the close affection which had united us as sister and brother for so many years, sympathy in religious sentiment had always borne a large part. It began with my turn to the ministry and gained strength through my College period; the studies, thoughts, and aspirations of which supplied the chief materials of our intercourse in the correspondence of the session and the outpourings of the vacation. Her first publications were devotional and theological, and the tales which succeeded them were tinged throughout with the same convictions and softened by the same light. Prior to the birth of this element in us both, we had not, as girl and boy, drawn together in any special companionship; for we naturally cared for different things, and were educated on different lines. How completely she herself recognised this sacred ground of the relation between us is apparent through all her correspondence. Her enthusiasm and generosity made her constantly urge me to literary work in partnership or parallelism with her; so that we should divide between us the proposals which editors poured in upon her, and of which, she thought, some might be handed over to me. When pressed and strongly tempted to help Lord Brougham in his reconstruction of 'Natural Theology,' but preoccupied with her 'Poor Law Tales,' she said to me, 'Let me but have something of yours to lay my finger upon against I see the Chancellor, and we will be side by side, as we have ever been. *You* shall battle with Atheism (as Lord

Brougham wants me to do), while *I* fight the Poor Laws. O how glorious!'

"That the fulfilment of this prophecy should place me, not side by side with her, but face to face with a book that bears her name, could not fail to sadden at least, if not to shake, a friendship of such foundation. Does it mend the case to say that the book is not atheistic, inasmuch as it does not deny a 'First Cause'? It maintains, at all events, precisely the positions with which, so designated, I was invited to 'battle.' And as to the verbal question, 'Atheism' has always been understood to mean, not the denial of a 'First Cause' ἁπλῶς, but the denial that the 'First Cause' is *God, i. e.*, an Intending and Governing Mind; nor can we depart from this usage without the absurd result of treating Büchner and those who find their 'First Cause' in 'Matter and Force' as *Theists.* How, then, did this book really affect me? Did it alienate or embitter me? Did it make further intercourse, and quiet discussion of the very questions at issue, impossible? Did it blind me to my sister's eminent gifts and nobleness in life and character, or alter in the least the tone in which I habitually spoke of her? I distinctly deny it. It simply mingled an element of sorrow with my affection, — of inevitable regret that from its resources there had fallen away a large class of common admirations and the whole force of a concurrent reverence. For this loss there would have been some alleviation, had the process which led to it commanded much intellectual respect. But, to my amazement, her convictions had yielded to the most incompetent arguments without any apparent resistance to the pretentious dogmatism with which they were advanced; and, in proportion to my estimate of her characteristic vigour of understanding, was this exceptional submission to an inferior mortifying to me. It seemed a kind of fascination, — part of the contemporaneous disturbance of judgment which, as I thought, was conspicuous in her reports of mesmeric phenomena, whether experienced or observed.

"In this state of feeling I attended the editorial meeting at Mr. Tayler's house, to lay out the contents of the next number of the 'Prospective.' Our division of labour charged me with the notice of the literature of philosophy, and my colleagues urged upon me the necessity of reviewing the 'Letters.' I felt and pleaded the difficult relation in which the task would place me; but yielded to two reconciling considerations, — that any other critic would more severely press upon my sister's share in the joint production; and that the volume would be cor-

rectly treated as the work of Mr. Atkinson, my sister being avowedly content with drawing him out, and securing his expositions for the world. Upon these lines, accordingly, the review is worked out. In one sentence only is my sister mentioned, — a sentence of grief for what she had surrendered to a misleading guide; while all that precedes gives the measure of Mr. Atkinson from his previous writings, and all that follows is a reasoned analysis of his arguments in the volume itself. The effect of the paper thus constructed is now well known. For three years I was unaware of the breach it had occasioned; and learned it only when, being with my family within a few miles of Ambleside, and proposing, through a letter of my wife's, a few hours' visit at the Knoll, I found that my sister's house and heart were closed against me. The review was charged with all the offences of which Mrs. Chapman has since accused it, — but only in general terms of vituperation. To an entreaty that the alleged instances of false quotation and misleading statement should be pointed out, that I might at least have the chance of making amends for my own wrong, a curt refusal was returned. A similar demand, as I have recently learned, had already been addressed to her, in the form of a collective remonstrance, by our three surviving sisters and brother, and had met with a similar reception. Neither directly, therefore, nor indirectly, have I ever been able to discover the passages for which I ought either to apologise or make adequate defence. All the citations were accompanied by proper references, which render the detection of 'garbling' easy and certain. All the statements of opinion are either in the author's words, or compends of ampler expositions indicated by page and line; so that they are readily put to the test. All the arguments are in a form distinct and compressed, so as to leave no scope for evasion, but to lie open to exposure and attack. I can only say that of the critical offences imputed to me I am unconscious, and the motives assumed for them I know to be fictitious.

"After all, I believe that the unpardonable sin of that article lay simply in this, — that from certain forgotten numbers of the 'Zoist' I disinterred some lucubrations of Mr. Atkinson's, the mere citation of which rendered his authority ridiculous. They probably took my sister by surprise, and, distressing her pure literary taste, embarrassed for a moment her admiring intercourse with her correspondent; but, when explained away by the ingenuities of friendship, acted with the power of a misfortune in common, and turned a united resentment upon the

critic who occasioned it. That I did not foresee this was a real fault in my reckoning. Having said the least possible about my sister's share in the book, I felt no obligation of reserve with regard to the remaining author, whose name I never heard before, and whose qualifications to announce the laws of 'man's nature and development' I had to estimate merely from the evidence of his own writings. Losing sight altogether of his influence on my sister, I treated this question purely on its merits, and freely said of him what I should have said of any anonymous and unrelated author. However natural this was for me, it was no less natural for my sister to resent being spared criticism herself at the expense of her friend; and this generous impulse, I believe, it was which, making her cast in her lot with his, defeated my purpose in criticising him alone, and not only rendered his quarrel hers, but intensified it with unrestrained exaggeration.

"Looking back at this calm distance at the whole transaction, I think it open to reasonable doubt whether it was well for me to become the critic of the 'Letters' at all, even in the impersonal form of an anonymous reviewer. And I might have anticipated the fruitlessness of my attempt to withdraw the master from the disciple and try conclusions with him alone. But in the substance of the critique I see nothing to correct or retract. And in its tone I do not notice any uncalled-for severity. If compared with Edward Forbes's review of the same book (fairly representing the purely scientific estimate of its character), it indubitably stands much further within the limits of patient and considerate controversy.

. . . . . .

"The estrangement produced by this cause and its antecedents was all on one side. My affection for my sister Harriet survived all reproaches and mistakes, and, if she had permitted, would at any moment have taken me to her side for unconditional return to the old relation. If time had lessened our sympathies of thought, it had enlarged those of character, and had developed in her a cheerful fortitude, an active benevolence, an unflinching fidelity to conviction, on which I looked with joyful honour, and in view of which all vexing memories were ready to die away."

It must not be concealed that the accuracy of the foregoing account of the origin of the review has been called in question, and that the recollection of one or more of the

editors of the " Prospective " differed from Dr. Martineau's. In one particular his memory was certainly not *exact*. He says that in one sentence only is his sister mentioned, while all that precedes gives the measure of Mr. Atkinson. In fact Miss Martineau is mentioned, though not selected for animadversion, in three other passages, and, " the authors " are united in a sarcastic description of their pretensions. The statement, also, that *three* years elapsed before he was aware of the breach requires a little explanation. He was aware at an earlier time that his sister was offended, but not that she was completely alienated from him. Early in 1853 Mrs. Martineau wrote to her sister-in-law, reporting the engagement of Mr. Leyson Lewis to her daughter Isabella. The result of this correspondence was subsequently communicated in a letter to Mr. Lewis: " We grieve to infer, from her [Miss Martineau's] very cold reply, to Isabella, to my letter written in perfect good faith to herself (to which and to ourselves she made not the slightest allusion) that she feels herself not on terms with us. And, on consulting Ellen on the subject, we learn that she does not forgive her brother's review of Mr. Atkinson's horrible book (which it was such a painful duty in him to write, and in which he *so* spared *her*), and instead of openly discussing the subject with himself (as one literary person would with another, *e. g.*, Mr. Newman with Mr. M., without any shade coming thereby across their friendship) she uses hard names, and talks against him, and has never exchanged a word with us since." This event excited misgivings; but it was hoped that the annoyance was temporary, and it was not till the summer of 1854 that Miss Martineau herself declared a reconciliation to be quite out of the question, and that her brother's fears were turned into certainty.

If, however, a searching ingenuity can detect any lapse of memory by comparing existing documents, it is so slight

as to be quite insignificant, and probably his attention was not called to it; but in regard to what took place at the editorial meeting his recollection was challenged, and, after full consideration, he still thought he had reason to rely on its accuracy. This appears from the continuation of his letter to Mr. Wicksteed cited above: —

"With regard to your recollection of the meeting at which we blocked out the May 'Prospective,' 1851, I can only say that it is so completely at variance with my own as to fill me with amazement, notwithstanding my frequent experience of the wide discrepancies of memory in witnesses of the same transaction. On some of the details of the conversation I cannot pretend to have clear impressions. But the things on which I have no doubt, and as to which I should unhesitatingly declare, in a witness box, that I had absolute knowledge, are, that we were sitting at the table, — Tayler at the bottom, you and Thom at the side to his left, I at the opposite side; that Thom *assumed* that I should undertake the Atkinson volume, as falling within my department; that I, admitting this as in conformity with rule, yet stated the personal objection as a serious difficulty; that Tayler at first felt the weight of this difficulty, but, on the suggestion, chiefly by Thom, but partly by myself, — thinking aloud, as it were, in the line of what he said, — came completely round, and ended with a thorough resistance to my misgiving. So far as he is concerned, I am sure, from subsequent conversations and letters, that this is a true account of his ultimate feeling and judgment. Between Thom and myself I do not think the review was ever a subject of conversation afterwards. The only point on which my memory agrees with yours is as to your silence. I remember it the more because it left upon my mind a doubt as to your opinion. These matters are not with me distant recollections; for as soon as the review became the subject of remark, I wrote down all the particulars of the story in a paper which was read by my wife and young people, who had heard from me all its details from the first moment; and that paper I still have."

The paper here alluded to was written on July 27, 1854, at Skelwith Bridge, near Ambleside, immediately after the correspondence with Miss Martineau mentioned above in the Biographical Memoranda. It contains a careful defence,

no longer needed, of his perfect good faith in writing the review, and of the style of treatment adopted in it. It says little of the editorial meeting; but it states distinctly that the only question among the editors was, *who* should write the article, and that the considerations which weighed with him were pressed upon him by his colleagues, and induced him to retain his usual function, and undertake a task which he regarded as an indispensable — most assuredly a painful — duty. The paper is private; but it is only fair to say that it is a calm survey of the case, and contains no unkind expression.

In judging of this confessedly severe review it must be remembered that Mr. Martineau knew nothing of Mr. Atkinson except from the "Letters," and some writings in the "Zoist"; and his criticisms are directed simply to his opinions and his manner of expressing them. It is, however, only just to state that Mr. Atkinson, and also Miss Martineau, disclaimed the designation of Atheist, so that the very title of the review, though quite susceptible of Mr. Martineau's defence, seemed to them unfair. Miss Martineau was probably what would now be described as agnostic. Mr. Atkinson seems to have had a sort of mystical element in him; and, forgetting the reproof which he had received for using the word God, he wrote as follows to Miss Martineau on Good Friday in this very year: "We want rousing from a lethargy, that we may listen to the God of heaven and of earth who speaks to us in our hearts. The word of God is in every man, if he will listen. God is with us in all Nature, if we will but read the written law; written not on tables of stone, but on the wide expanse of nature. Yes, the savage is more right. God is in the clouds, and we hear him in the wind. Yes; and in the curse of ignorance, and the voice of reprobation, there too is God, — warning us of ignorance, — of unbelief of temper, — putting another law in our way, that we may read and interpret

the book of fate. O! that some great teacher would arise, and make himself heard from the mountain top! The man whom they crucified on this day gave a sermon on a mount. It is in every house, in every head; it is known, passage after passage; but in how few has it touched the heart, and opened the understanding!" [1] This letter is so curiously inconsistent with passages in the "Letters" as to make it quite intelligible that Mr. Atkinson and his admirer should regard as unjust a description of his opinions drawn from the "Letters" alone, his thought being in fact made up of most discordant elements. No one can be surprised that Miss Martineau was wounded by the review, in which for the moment Mr. Martineau, in the ardour of his criticism, may have failed to give sufficient attention to the tender human feelings which often lie behind the most perverse opinions. It is, however, a matter of regret that she did not act in the spirit of her own words, used in relation to a coarse review of one of her early tales: "The testing of one's power of endurance is pleasurable; and the testing of one's power of forgiveness is yet sweeter." [2] But we must remember that she expressed to Mrs. Chapman her desire, "when you speak of my brother James, be as gentle as you can." [3] This injunction of her friend, Mrs. Chapman fulfilled by an imputation of the basest motives, which only malignity or stupidity could suggest, and which are unfit for further notice.[4] This narrative may close with the opinion of Mr. F. W. Newman, written at the time: "You have performed a painful but wholesome duty in your review of Atkinson and Martineau."

Passing from these controversial topics, we must briefly notice Mr. Martineau's review of "The Creed of Christendom," by William Rathbone Greg, published in the

[1] H. M. Aut., II. p. 369.
[2] *Ib.*, I. p. 206.
[3] *Ib.*, III. p. 322.
[4] *Ib.*, III. p. 319.

"Westminster Review" in July, 1851.[1] In the course of this review he defends the truth of Paul's "assertion of his intercourse with the risen Christ," and gives a fine account of the doctrine of development, when freed from subservience "to monstrous sacerdotal claims." The prophets prepared a future veiled from their own eyes, and "Christianity becomes thus, not the Creed of its Founders, but the Religion of Christendom, . . . the providential introduction among the affairs of this world of a divine influence, which shall gradually reach to untried depths in the hearts of men, and become the organising centre of a new moral and spiritual life." In the plan of the Divine government there was not only more than had been surmised, but something at variance with all expectation. "Never absent from the mind of God, and never pausing in its course of execution, it had yet evaded the notice of all observers; and winding its way through the throng of nations and the labyrinth of centuries, the great Thought had passed in disguise, using all men and known of none."

On the 15th of June, 1851, Dr. Robert Vaughan, President of the Lancashire Independent College, and editor of the "British Quarterly Review," was present in Hope Street Church, and heard a sermon on the text, "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." In the August number of the "Review" appeared a description of this sermon, which Mr. Martineau felt to be a misrepresentation of its scope and spirit; and accordingly he was induced to print the sermon exactly as it was delivered, under the title, "The God of Revelation his own Interpreter." Dr. Vaughan no doubt reported faithfully the impression which the sermon made upon him; and it is easy to understand that one who was sincerely attached to the old Evangelicalism would be

[1] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity."

startled and shocked by the bold handling of what at that time was a novel thesis, especially as the sermon, even from the preacher's point of view, is open to the charge of some exaggeration. It is founded on the very fruitful thought, that the divine significance of a great religious movement must be carefully distinguished from the personal views and purposes of the agents who force it on the attention of the world, and that therefore it is fully disclosed only when the merely human and temporary forms in which it clothed itself drop away in the course of its history. It sets forth in these words the changes which mark the unfolding of the religion into its divine ideal: "We have emerged from the Religion of *Law,* whose only sentiment is that of *obedience to Sovereignty;* we have passed from the Religion of *Salvation,* whose life consists in *gratitude to a Deliverer;* and we are capable only of a religion of *Reverence,* which bows before the *authority of Goodness.*" In earlier writings Mr. Martineau had freely spoken of Jesus as "the Messiah"; but here he plainly announces a view to which in later life he attached the greatest importance: "To discuss whether Jesus was the Messiah is even more unmeaning than the question whether John the Baptist were Elijah; for Elijah was at least a person, but Messiah was only a conception. . . . Seeking Christianity in the creed of the first age, we have necessarily fallen in with this notion, that 'Jesus is the Messiah'; and have thus set up the chief Judaic error as the chief Christian verity."

This sermon was unfavourably noticed in "The Christian Reformer," or "Unitarian Magazine and Review," which had previously reproduced Dr. Vaughan's account of it, and given a most contemptuous description of Mr. Martineau's review of "The Creed of Christendom." This treatment roused the indignation of Mr. R. H. Hutton, who, in a letter of September 19, says: "It does make me feel more and more that while our names are among the

Unitarians, there never was before a case in which a true name conveyed so much falsity of impression in classing wholly different faiths together, and it makes me wish greatly that we were no longer burdened with the credit of belonging to the old Unitarian views and faith. Can this never be?" At the same time he thinks that Mr. Martineau's statement of his views is exaggerated, and lays his meaning open to misconstruction. The following is Mr. Martineau's reply. The date of the copy is probably wrong, as Mr. Hutton's autograph is dated September 19. The conclusion is retained as illustrating the writer's more playful style.

TO R. H. HUTTON.

LIVERPOOL, Sept. 18, 1851.

MY DEAR RICHARD, — . . . This "British Quarterly" affair . . . has had on me the effect, in which I perceive you sympathise, of fixing my thoughts on the moral and religious questions which are agitating our people. I have been asking myself the question which you propose, "Is the time come for a settlement of accounts with our critics and objectors?" The temptations are perpetual, not only from open strictures in reviews, but from a constant outpouring of unkindly allusion and weak misapprehension on such occasions as the recent opening at Birkenhead. But let patience have its perfect work. I determined to write privately to Mr. Aspland, not at all in relation to any *criticisms* in the "Reformer," but to complain of his lending his pages to give circulation to Dr. Vaughan's caricature of the Sermon, without ever writing to ask me the question whether I had preached such a thing. He has taken it well and replies rather apologetically. The correspondence is probably not closed; and I am in hopes of bringing about a better feeling in a quiet way. It is evident to me that there is, in the party which he represents, an intellectual *fear,* which will prevent in case of a controversy any ingenuous and tranquil reliance on the inherent strength of their own cause, or any thorough treatment of the subjects of difference. Conscious of their weakness here, they will be driven to appeal (as indeed they now do) to mere catchword prejudices and party apprehensions and passions; a storm will be raised, and will affect more or less all our congregations, poisoning with unworthy

feelings all the sweetness of the religious air. Indeed, which of us could trust himself to remain unaffected by the taint? Truth therefore would not gain, and piety and affection would probably suffer. I am therefore for peace as long as possible. And with this feeling it appears to me also best that, if any defence is really called for, it should in the first instance be made, not by a generous bystander, who would almost unavoidably be led into remarks on the personal elements and accidental temper of the discussion, but by the writer whose views are attacked and who would naturally limit himself to an attempt at better exposition of the opinions themselves. I do not despair of our obtaining in this way a fair hearing after all. Moreover, I should like to see you in a fixed ministerial position before you become mixed up with anything like party discussions, which would make you enemies among the bigots and the indifferent in every congregation. In a mere question of time and occasion (for the same provocations are sure to be continued) this *ought* to have some influence with you. My own intention is to wait and see how the "Reformer" and "Inquirer" deal with this sermon; and also how far Mr. Harris's Birkenhead Sermon, if published (I believe it was in the same tone) necessitates a notice. Should the spirit of ill-humour and alarm continue it will be a less evil to put an end to the truce than to prolong a mere uneasy peace; and I shall feel no further scruple about throwing a shell into the opposite camp. In moments of despondency I often think we *should* do our work better, if we could be free of the old Unitarians, and act in avowed separation. But my permanent feeling is the other way. I believe they are "old" Unitarians and will not last for ever. You see how Dr. Vaughan estimates the prospects of the newer element. By the way, one of his Divinity students in the Independent College wrote to me the other day to ask for an autograph. So I wrote the youth's name with proper phrases of respect, on the sermon, which had just come in from the Printer's and sent it by post to the Headquarters. As to the doctrine of the sermon, you are probably quite right in saying that I have virtually overstated the amount of the merely human element in the New Testament. Of course I did not mean to banish *all* the divine and revealing thought and influence into the Apostle's *unconscious* life. But still I do think that even the greatest truth — such as Paul's regeneration by faith — struggled in their minds beneath such a mass of temporary conceptions as never to succeed in expressing itself in a *pure* form. It was *felt* and strove towards embodiment; and

in reading Paul, the spark catches and kindles in our hearts, so that the truth is secured. But when you collect and state Paul's *dogma* on the point, it is so embedded in Messianic theory as to be unpresentable to modern belief. I could never determine the Percentage of human and divine, because they are inextricably intermixed and only the human has *quantity* at all. But no mere difference of implied *proportion* would have had the least effect, I am persuaded, on the alarmists, whose habitual modes of thought are at variance with the entire principle. The conditions under which the sermon was written give a different aspect to what might else appear exaggeration. I was fresh from Mr. Greg's book, and was not without the idea of possibly working up the argument into the "Review." I wished to show that Mr. Greg's method did not do the fatal execution which he supposed; but that if it were ever so successful, and made as clean a sweep, as he could claim for it, a way was still open for maintaining that the divine and inspired character of Christianity, as a supernatural revelation, was undisturbed. The argument, thus addressed to *him,* required that I should concede his success or waive the disposition to dispute it. But when it is now read, as if addressed to the ordinary Christian state of mind, that which was a needful logical conception in *defence* of Christianity, assumes the aspect of a positive surrender of much of its defensible ground of *attack.* The only thing in the "Reformer" that really grieved me is the treatment given to the attempt I had made in defence of the doctrines of Prayer and Forgiveness. An effort, however imperfect, to arrest scepticism on such points and deliver them from the habitual scorn of the "Westminster Review" school, should at least be gently dealt with. And though the exposition is perhaps chargeable with obscurity, I cannot think that any open-minded reader would find it impossible to discover a pertinent meaning in it. And what is the use of appealing, in answer to Mr. Greg's theoretical objections, to the Christian precepts in favour of prayer? I quite agree with you about Dr. Vaughan's article. The weakness of the argument is so deplorable as to be quite painful; and I scarcely know how to resist the impression that the author is not without uneasy suspicions of its weakness. Such a defence is assuredly more dangerous to Christianity than Mr. Greg's attack. I am surprised also at the great coarseness of the style. I had quite a different impression of Vaughan's literary qualities. Keep a good heart, my dear Richard, about the ministry, whatever Sheffield may say. Those cutters and knife-grinders are a case-

hardened people who must be expected to steel their hearts against the most melting fervour of appeal. If an enemy had chosen for you the most hopeless beginnings he would have sent you to Bath, Birmingham, and Sheffield. I feel *no* doubt of your ultimate position, nor do I think the trial of your patience will be much prolonged. How we should delight to see you! I had hoped to ask you to spend a few days with Trendelenburg. But he writes to say he is going home without coming North.

With our united kindest regards to your wife and Mrs. Roscoe, ever dear Richard

Affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

His letters to the Rev. R. Brook Aspland, the Editor of "The Christian Reformer," are worthy of attention, as illustrating the great gentleness and courtesy which he maintained when he found it necessary to write a remonstrance.

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, LIVERPOOL, Sept. 11, 1851.

DEAR SIR, — My attention has been called to a notice, in the last number of "The Christian Reformer," of Dr. Vaughan's article on the "Creed of Christendom," and the report, cited from that article, of a certain sermon preached from a Unitarian pulpit; and I find that you were aware, before going to press, who was the preacher alluded to by Dr. Vaughan. Now nothing can be further from my desire than to violate in any way the respect due to editorial freedom, especially where it is exercised so honourably and usefully as it is in the case of the "Reformer." No criticism of sentiments and opinions, no judgment on matters of taste, would ever awaken in me the slightest aggrieved or mortified feeling, or tempt me to a word of remonstrance. Such criticism, with all its liability to occasional mistake and ill humour, is a wholesome instrument of discipline, with whose due application no dissentient feeling would induce me to interfere. But it is otherwise with the report of facts and the circulation of sketches directly personal; and I cannot but complain that you have lent the pages of the "Reformer" to give additional currency to a statement which you avowedly regard as discreditable to me, and injurious to our religious body, without ascertaining its correctness or giving me an opportunity of explanation. It cannot be for the interests of the denomination which you represent that the

caricatures drawn of us by theological opponents should be accepted, not only without an expression of distrust or a word of regret, but with manifest eagerness and sympathy. And it seems to me not friendly, or even just, to believe and to reprint evil of one another, without even an attempt to learn at first hand whether it be true or not. No doubt you repudiate the sentiments, and pronounce against the wisdom of a brother minister *only hypothetically, in case* the sentiments and the act should be his, as rumour avers. But this seems to me like spreading a scandalous "on dit" of my neighbour's character and then contenting oneself with the heartless comment, that *if* the thing be true I quite disapprove of it. Why did you not frankly write to me before disdaining me, and say, "Did you really preach this thing?"

I write my word of expostulation to you in your private capacity, because it is not desirable to publish every little shade of uneasiness that passes over us as a religious denomination. But openly as I speak I have no unkindly feeling; indeed in the very act of speaking openly I wipe off all notion of offence; and having explained to you, shall repeat the complaint to no one else. The thousand difficulties of an editor, and all the chances of an occasional error which shall do imperfect justice to his better and permanent feeling, are present to my mind. I shall think, therefore, no more of this. I only wish to prevent, so far as in me lies, the growth of an alienation founded on suspicion and reserve.

I am, dear Sir, as ever,
Yours faithfully,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

P.S. — The obnoxious sermon will be published to-morrow, and will speak for itself. I can hardly hope for your concurrence in its doctrine. But I shall be surprised if you think the impression given of it by Dr. Vaughan fair or even veracious.

Mr. Aspland, in his reply, expresses his "admiration of the gentleness and good-temper" displayed "under strong provocation to feelings and conduct of a different kind"; but at the same time states his conviction that Mr. Martineau's "views destroyed not only the very foundation of Unitarianism, but also that of all revealed religion. We may," he adds, "be quite wrong in this, but we hold this

opinion sincerely and sorrowfully." Mr. Martineau notices this position in the following letter: —

LIVERPOOL, Sept. 17, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR, — I send for your acceptance a copy of the obnoxious sermon, which was not ready for delivery at the date of my last note. In asking for an unprejudiced consideration of it, I have no desire to intercept that just course of honest criticism which an editor and public teacher owes to his readers and his conscience. I am not less grateful to you for the frank expression of dissent contained in your note of the 14th, than for your considerate acknowledgment that my word of expostulation may not have been entirely without ground. Indeed I am anxious to repeat that it was not against any severity or personality in the *comments of the* "Christian Reformer" that I made complaint; but simply against the adoption, without direct verification, of Dr. Vaughan's caricature, as a sufficient ground for a verdict of repudiation. Had the very same comments been made upon the Sermon duly authenticated by publication, I should have felt no displeasure, however sorry to be excluded from sympathy with [one whom] I deeply value and respect.

I was not at all aware that the sermon in question had been made the subject of any remark, beyond a word or two that fell from Mr. Chorley in conversation with me at the College examination. Nor had I the least consciousness of its tendency to excite the sort of feeling which it has called forth. I fear you will regard this as only the indication of an incorrigible *habit* of heresy.

I readily acknowledge that the grounds of your expressed dissent from the opinions imputed to me are grave and sufficient, provided they are real. But I am at a loss to understand how they can appear to be so. You and I are equally, I imagine, believers in revealed religion, and in the *same* revealed religion; *i. e.,* in the same essential view of life, of God, of futurity, as imparted to us by the supernatural inspiration of Christ. But while both the *religion authorised* and the *source of authorisation* are the same, we probably take different views of the *mode* of authorisation; the evidence which satisfies each of us being inconclusive with the other. Is it right to call this a "destruction of the foundations of revealed religion"? Do I any more destroy your foundation than you destroy mine? Certainly, if you held my negative views without my positive, your faith in revealed religion would be gone; and this, I

think, is the case probably present to your imagination. But equally should I cease to be a Christian, if, without adopting your estimate of the external evidences, I sympathised with your repudiation of the internal as they present themselves to me. Yet I should never think of describing this fact by speaking of you as implicitly a destroyer of revealed religion. We have always thought it illiberal in the orthodox to deny the name of Christian to us as Unitarians. Yet they differ from us in the religion itself, — in the whole thing supposed to be revealed. If, in the case of such a difference as this, it be a narrow thing to impute "infidelity," can it be less so when the faith received as of divine authority is the same, and the only difference has relation to the proper instruments of proof? Were I simply to yield to my own impression of Dr. Vaughan's defence of Inspiration in the article on Greg, I should say, that he had done what was possible to render the cause of Christianity hopeless, by so deplorable an exhibition of weakness. This I fancy is pretty much what you feel with respect to the method of reasoning which I should import into the same subjects. But surely it is not right in either case to substitute, in our estimate of a man's faith and labours, the consequences which *we* should deduce from his premises, for those which he evolves for himself. Is not this indeed the very essence and principle of all uncharitable construction? — Is it nothing that we adore the same infinite Spirit, revere the same authoritative type of perfection, feel the Divine obligation of the same Moral Law, and cherish the same immortal hope? And must we, in forgetfulness of this profound and ultimate agreement, suspect and excommunicate each other, because the logical paths by which we reach it do not coincide? And affect concurrence with those whose whole view of the Divine government and basis of trust is utterly at variance with ours? What is this but to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel?

But I have no intention to draw you into any discussion on this matter. My only wish is to alleviate every uneasy feeling arising from misapprehension and fostered by the over-sensitive condition of the theological imagination. Where public occasion arises for adverting to the points really at issue, it is greatly to be desired that they should be treated with a single and thorough regard to *what is true,* without reflection upon persons or reckoning of consequences. There seems to me throughout our religious body a marked and melancholy decline of late years in this spirit of confiding openness to truth, and a constant approach to the particular style of argument, at

once irritated and reserved which characterises frightened sects. When I turn to Dr. Priestley I find a direct and fearless penetration to the core of every subject, which, when compared with the shifty partisanship of the present day, makes me feel how we have receded from the example of a pure, ingenuous, and earnest mind.

With renewed thanks for your friendly and candid reception of my remonstrance,

I remain, my dear Sir,
Ever faithfully yours,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

In 1852 the "Prospective Review" contained two philosophical essays, one on the "Theory of Reasoning," the other on "The Soul in Nature."[1] The latter appears in the Essays under the corrected title, "The Unity of Mind in Nature." Of a more theological type is a powerful article on "The Ethics of Christendom."[2] In this article Mr. Martineau defends the thesis that the fundamental idea of Christendom is *"the ascent through Conscience into communion with God,"* and "to this sentiment, conveyed with living realisation in the person of Jesus Christ, may be referred whatever is distinctively great in Christian ethics." But though it vindicated itself in the scheme of applied morals, these are so mixed up with the errors of a particular time that, when they are distorted into a rigid code, the original idea is often entirely reversed. The expectation of the immediate end of the world imposed upon the first age certain lines of conduct which are purely mischievous when transferred to our own; and the effort of Protestantism to take the apostolic age as an exact model for all time has led to the co-existence of two codes, the religious and the secular, in the same social body, and even in the same man. His views in regard to the legitimacy of force are

[1] Both reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological" (2d series), 1869, and in Essays, III.

[2] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity," from the "Westminster Review," January, 1852.

strongly expressed. The non-resistance of the first disciples only meant that they were not to anticipate the hour, fast approaching, of Messiah's descent to claim his throne. "The new reign was to come with *force;* and on nothing else, in the last resort, was there any reliance." Hence he treats as a mischievous class "the amiable enthusiasts who propose to conduct the affairs of nations on principles of brotherly love." Human life is not so sacred as justice and right, and all government exists to enforce law by the infliction of punishment for its violation. He considers it a delusion to rely on courts as a substitute for armies; for only a European army could enforce their decrees. This, however, is only one illustration of its main theme, which is, to maintain the rights of the natural conscience at once against the extreme Lutheran doctrine and its modern antithesis: "Neither do we believe with Luther, that human nature is a mere *devilish* anarchy, reducible only by supernatural irruption; nor with the newest school, that it is a *divine* anarchy, equally uncontrollable from within, and to be accepted as a wild fact; but that it is a *hierarchy of powers,* each having and knowing its rightful place, and appealing to us to maintain it there."

In the same year appeared a review of "The Restoration of Belief."[1] This relates chiefly to the state of religious belief which at that time characterised English society, and to the grave defects in the author's mode of maintaining the truth of Christianity, and the unfairness of his attacks on such men as Newman and Greg. Consequently, though it is written with Mr. Martineau's usual clearness and force, it is more temporary in its scope than many of his other essays, and introduces us to little with which we are not already familiar in his thought. One or two sentences, however, may be quoted: "Religion, in its ultimate essence,

[1] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity," from the "Westminster Review," July, 1852.

is a sentiment of Reverence for a Higher than ourselves. . . . Reverence can attach itself exclusively to a *person;* it cannot direct itself on what is *im*personal. . . . All the sentiments characteristic of religion presuppose a Personal Object, and assert their power only where Manhood is the type of Godhead."

In the course of this year a review of Rogers's "Eclipse of Faith," from the pen of the Rev. Charles Wicksteed, appeared in the "Prospective." F. W. Newman thought that this review did him a grave injustice by adopting Rogers's misrepresentations of the views expressed in "Phases of Faith." On August 11 he wrote a remonstrance to Mr. Martineau, complaining at the same time that the latter had misunderstood the passage about Fletcher of Madeley. On the 13th Mr. Martineau replied, defending his own criticisms, but declaring that he had read the review "with serious mortification and offence." On the 18th he sent a long communication on the subject to Mr. Wicksteed, who, however, was unable to perceive that any reparation was due; and, after some further correspondence, Mr. Martineau, moved by a chivalrous sense of justice, wrote the following letter: —

PARK NOOK, LIVERPOOL, Sept. 9, 1852.

MY DEAR WICKSTEED, — Your decision to let Mr. Newman's remonstrance pass without result — a decision which, with your view of the case, is perfectly natural — settles the affair as between you and him; and though he may regret his inability to convince you, he has no right to expect an acknowledgment from you which you could not sincerely make.

And as between you and the "Prospective," there is nothing but a difference of judgment, which — though certainly affecting our treatment of very fundamental matters — I should be altogether disinclined to press to any serious consequences, and should be quite content with discussing in hope of attaining greater unity for the future, or permitting to remain, were this impossible.

But as between Mr. Newman and myself, I feel the case to be very different. He complains to me, as a responsible Editor,

of a literary injustice; I acknowledge to him that he has grounds for his complaint, and undertake to see, as far as in me lies, that right shall be done. In this I fail. Nothing can be plainer than that I am in honour bound to withdraw from a position, in which I am obliged to confess, and unable to repair, an injustice. Inability to give effect to *opinions on matters of thought* is no sufficent reason for quitting a joint enterprise, necessarily involving a mixture and balance of judgments. But inability to give effect to one's *sense of right in matters of personal ethics* is an imperative reason for declining a responsibility whose moral conditions can no longer be answered. Did I not act on this principle, I should feel as if always under Mr. Newman's silent reproach; "you felt that your 'Review' had done me wrong, yet made yourself a party to smothering the wrong and putting a good face upon it; and this, though you knew that by my frequent contributions to the 'Prospective,' and your friendly notices of my books, your 'Review' was likely to be particularly trusted as a fair expounder of my views."

I have therefore only to write to Newman and report to him that I have ceased to be one of the Editors of the "Review." This done, I shall not feel it necessary to make any public explanation of the reason for withdrawal; but shall simply wish some advertisements to appear immediately with the omission of my name. I shall still be not less willing than before to accept, as a contributor, any work that may be entrusted to me, and that other claims allow me to execute. In short, it will make no difference in my feeling towards the "Review" or towards my dear and honoured Editorial friends, — whom I know to be as good and noble and simply truth-loving, where they leave me to a lonely path, as where I can walk with them side by side.

. . . . . .

Ever affectionately yours,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

Mr. Wicksteed immediately replied in a kind letter, saying that he must be the one to withdraw. However, "a long and brisk controversy" took place among the Editors; and on the 15th of October Mr. Martineau was able to write to Newman, proposing that he should send for insertion in the next number a note, addressed to the writer of the

"Review," stating compendiously the points on which he felt that his sentiments had been unfairly presented. This proposal was declined; and Mr. Martineau wrote as follows on October 27: —

My dear Newman, — It grieves me that it seems to you impossible for us to do anything towards setting you right with our readers; and still more, that a former article of mine should be the obstacle hindering us from making due reparation now. What can I say, but that I have entertained no wish in relation to the article on the "Eclipse of Faith" that I would not equally apply to the article on the "Phases"; and that the "Prospective" would have been open, had I known, as the "Miscellanies" are still, now that I do know your feeling, to any explanation or complaint you may judge to be fit? I cannot truthfully confess any consciousness of mistake or wrong; but if I have unconsciously given you cause to feel "aggrieved," I should desire that others might have an opportunity of correcting me where I cannot correct myself. But may it not be that *any* Review containing strong expressions of dissent — expressions no stronger than you would yourself feel to be natural and necessary in noticing a work assailing your convictions — would produce much the same impression.

The matter of course dies a natural death, as the only course which occurred to us as at once possible and incumbent on us is declined. As to your being "one of our writers," it was not in the least on that ground that we made our proposal; except that it must needs be more painful to hurt a friend and benefactor than a stranger. But for the future, if you desire it, we will not ask you to help us; only do not refuse to receive our numbers as they appear, if it be but to scold us at the right time and place, and check our aberrations. Let us keep you near us, if not as writer, at least as our faithful censor. At all events be not so unrelenting as positively to turn us out of your house.

. . . . . .

Yours ever affectionately,

James Martineau.

This called forth from Newman so warm a tribute of friendship that a few words must be quoted: "Though

your affection is so deep, and generosity so wide, I fear your sensitiveness may be something so intense, that I may be unable to still your pain at the idea that you have committed an injury on me, or that I think you have. . . . Now of this, my very dear and tender-hearted and conscientious friend, be assured. Your writing against has not made me think more meanly of your talents and of your insight, nor of your fairness; *but it has solely aided my charity towards others.* . . . As for you, I so know your noble heart, your upright mind, and your personal affection, that when *you also* misunderstand me, it has no weight whatever to make me for a moment think *you* do so on purpose." This letter was regarded as an act of oblivion, and after some further correspondence all ended amicably.

It may have been partly due to the depressing effect of these transactions that he became despondent about his health. He felt that he could not rely on it sufficiently to undertake extraneous engagements. He writes to his friend Wicksteed, September 9: "Somehow, this summer has made sad havoc with me; and I begin to think that, in this climate, I shall never be well again."

The great family event of the year 1853 was the engagement of the eldest daughter to Mr. Leyson Lewis. They were married by Mr. Thom in Hope Street Church on the 5th of October.

Events of a more public character now require us to go back a few years in our narrative. Attempts had been made to deprive the Unitarians of their chapels and other property which had come down to them from their forefathers. The decision of the House of Lords, in 1842, in the case of the Lady Hewley Trust, showed that under the existing law the endowments could not be retained, and it was necessary to seek for protection through an act of Parliament. As the congregations which were interested in these endowments were descended from the old English Presbyterians,

and in many instances retained the ancient name, a "Presbyterian Union" was formed, and a committee appointed, for promoting a Bill in Parliament to secure their property against future attacks. This Bill, known as the "Dissenters' Chapels Bill," was so obviously just that it was passed in both Houses by overwhelming majorities, the final division in the House of Lords being taken on the 15th of July, 1844. Without waiting for the Royal Assent, which was given on the 19th, a meeting of the General Committee of the Presbyterian Union was held at Fendall's Hotel, Old Palace Yard, on the 16th of July, under the presidency of Mr. Thomas Thornely, M.P.; and it was resolved "that, viewing this measure as the first legislative recognition of the great truth, that the sanctity of private judgment in matters of religion may be a principle in men's minds paramount to the holding of any peculiar dogmas, we would venture to suggest the formation of some permanent memorial, educational or otherwise, to perpetuate in the most useful form the great principle of unlimited religious liberty; and that the following Gentlemen be requested to form a Committee, with power to add to their number, to consider the means of carrying out this design." After various inquiries, a meeting of the Committee was held at Dr. Williams's Library, on the 28th of July, 1846, under the chairmanship of Mr. James Heywood, when it was resolved "that a building be erected or obtained for the residence and accommodation of young men attending University College, London, including suitable rooms for Lectures, a Library, and a Residence for a Principal or Superintendent. That the management of such building be placed under the control of a Committee. That the Students have every opportunity of attending all or any of the classes at University College, London. And that theological instruction be also given." The theological instruction was to be "of that impartial character which is calculated to promote and stim-

ulate religious inquiry and the exercise of private judgment." The Committee also thought it would be "of great moment that the sons of Non-Subscribing Dissenters should associate during their University career with Students of religious opinions differing from their own." The Institution would "constitute a most honourable and permanent memorial of the great principle of unlimited religious liberty." A circular embodying and recommending these proposals was sanctioned by the Committee on the 1st of December. Sufficient funds were raised, in the form of proprietary shares, and before June, 1848, contracts had been entered into for building University Hall in Gordon Square. The first stone was laid by Mr. Mark Philips on the 20th of July, and an address was delivered in the theatre of University College, kindly lent for the purpose, by Professor F. W. Newman, who had accepted the appointment of Principal. Newman, however, soon resigned; and the Hall was opened for students on the 16th of October, 1849, under the Principalship of the poet, Arthur Hugh Clough, late Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, Oxford, Mr. R. H. Hutton being, for one session, the Vice-Principal.

About the same time another institution was founded, which requires a moment's notice. On the 29th of July, 1846, Mr. John Owens, of Manchester, died, leaving property of about the value of £100,000, for the establishment in Manchester, or the immediate neighbourhood, of a College absolutely free from religious tests, and appointing trustees belonging to different denominations to carry out his purpose. A scheme constituting the College was, in due course, prepared by the trustees. An able Principal was found in Mr. Alexander John Scott, and on the 12th of March, 1851, Owens College was opened in a large dwelling-house in Quay Street, once the residence of Richard Cobden, where it remained for several years. This munificent endowment destroyed all lingering hopes of making Man-

chester New College the centre of the highest educational influences in the district.

By the establishment of these institutions the fortunes of Manchester New College, and through it of Mr. Martineau, were deeply affected. Although, at the time of the removal from York, the minority had loyally acquiesced in the decision which was adopted, yet the preference for London as the fitting locality for the College never died away. The apparent want of success attending the new experiment was carefully noted, and as early as 1844 a Special Committee was appointed to take into consideration the condition and prospects of the College. The Committee reported that the experiment was "entirely successful," basing their conclusion on the efficiency of the Professors, and the success of the students in the University of London. Nevertheless, the dissatisfaction remained, and at a general meeting of the Trustees, held on the 26th of June, 1846, a resolution was proposed recommending the Committee to take into consideration the advisability of continuing the College in Manchester. On a division this resolution was defeated, not, however, by a direct negative but by carrying "the previous question." In their Report presented to the Trustees at the Annual Meeting in 1847 the Committee expressed the hope that the students might, in time, resort to Owens College for a part of their instruction; and towards the close of the year they replied to a communication from the Council of University Hall that they were unable to enter into negotiations involving the question of a removal to London. In their Report, presented to the Annual Meeting of Trustees on the 16th of March, 1848, they recorded the foregoing facts, again suggested a connection with Owens College, and expressed an opinion strongly adverse to a connection with University College, London, or a union with University Hall. The motion, "that the Address be received and adopted," was met by

an amendment, " that all the words in the Report now read, be left out, which have reference to the continuance of Manchester New College, in Manchester." This amendment was carried by thirty-one to thirty; and a Special Committee was then appointed to consider the whole question, and report to a future meeting. Their report was presented on the 30th of June. It consisted chiefly of facts and considerations bearing on alternative plans. One point seemed for the moment of vital importance. A case had been submitted to Counsel, and Mr. Bethell and Mr. Roundell Palmer, of the Chancery Bar, had given their joint opinion that the proposed removal of the institution could not be lawfully effected, the original objects of the charity being clearly local. In June, 1850, as there was at last some prospect of the opening of Owens College, Mr. W. R. Wood proposed a series of resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, appointing a Special Committee to consider and obtain information on the question of a connection between the two Colleges. The following June the Special Committee was still unable to report, Owens College having been opened so recently. A special meeting of Trustees was held on the 17th of December, 1851, when the Special Committee presented their Report, in which they confined themselves mainly to a statement of facts, and recommended the Trustees to postpone the consideration of measures which had for their object a connection with Owens College. At this meeting Mr. Martineau spoke, pleading that the case entrusted to the consideration of a committee should be opened to the widest extent. He felt that circumstances were entirely changed since he had voted for the continuance of the institution in Manchester. It was now almost certain that they must limit themselves to a theological course, and rely upon some other College for completing the education of their students. University College would offer them a high standard of instruction. Mr. J. J. Tayler also spoke, main-

taining that experience had confirmed the view which he had always entertained in favour of London. Ultimately a large committee was appointed to consider the general position of the College. A few days afterwards, December 22, Mr. W. R. Wood addressed a letter to the Trustees who attended the meeting, stating that, after full deliberation, he should regard it as his duty to oppose any attempt to obtain parliamentary authority for the removal of the College from Manchester.

The decisive meeting was held on Dec. 8, 1852, in the Cross Street Chapel Room. The report of the Committee presented the necessary facts relating to Owens College, University College, and University Hall, and recommended the abandonment of the "Literary and Scientific Department of Manchester New College as an integral and separate institution." The opinion was expressed that the removal of the College, if unopposed, might be carried into effect without the sanction of an Act of Parliament; and it was stated that the Council of University Hall was quite willing to promote an amalgamation of the two institutions. The Rev. John Kenrick proposed a resolution approving of the "establishment of Manchester New College in London as a Theological Institution in connection, for literary and scientific purposes, with University College." This was seconded by Mr. Mark Philips. Mr. James Yates, who thought that the constitution of the College made it impossible to carry the resolution into effect, moved an amendment in favour of a connection with Owens College; and this was seconded by the Rev. Samuel Bache. Mr. Martineau spoke in support of the resolution, and considered the legal objection to be merely technical, and based on no well-defined principle. On a division the amendment was lost by thirty-three to seventeen, and the resolution was then carried, only three or four hands being held up against it. It was then decided that formal notice should be given

to the Professors of the termination of their engagements at the close of the session.

The fate of the College, however, was not yet settled. At the ensuing annual meeting in January it was announced that Mr. W. R. Wood had thought it his duty to commence proceedings with a view to a suit in Chancery, in order to prevent the establishment of the College in London. It was in the power of the majority of Trustees, under Sir Samuel Romilly's Act affecting Charitable Trusts, to proceed by way of petition to the Master of the Rolls, and accordingly the petition came before his Court, on Friday, February 25. Judgment was given on Wednesday, April 13, and was entirely in favour of the petitioners, and declared that it was "consistent with the original scope and object of the institution that the same should be transferred to London, or to such other place as, in the opinion of the majority of the Trustees for the time being, shall be best calculated to advance the objects and design of the institution."

The way was now clear for the adoption of new arrangements. On the 25th of May these were taken into consideration by a meeting of Trustees. The Special Committee appointed to prepare a scheme strongly recommended that, in addition to the purely theological staff, there should be a distinct Professorship of Mental and Moral Philosophy and Political Economy. This, however, would require a considerable increase in the funds, and it was therefore suggested, as an alternative scheme, that the professor of Doctrinal and Practical Theology should lecture on Christian Ethics, and that for more systematic instruction in Mental and Moral Science the services of a supplementary lecturer might be engaged. The smaller scheme was adopted, though not without the vote of a minority in favour of the larger one. It was then resolved unanimously to invite the Rev. J. J. Tayler to accept the offices of Principal and Professor of Ecclesiastical History. The follow-

ing October, Manchester New College took up its abode in University Hall. The two institutions, however, though cordially co-operating in the fulfilment of their educational ideals, retained their independent character, and neither was responsible for the success or failure of the other. The Principalship of the Hall was at this time, and for several years subsequently, held by Dr. W. B. Carpenter.

Both on public and private grounds these events were watched by Mr. Martineau with keen interest not unmixed with anxiety. A few extracts from his correspondence will exhibit his state of mind. The following paragraph, from a letter to his friend, the Rev. J. H. Thom, was written in consequence of a proposal of the College Committee which he found it impossible to entertain: —

PARK NOOK, Jan. 13, 1852.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — . . . So dissipates itself another fond dream of renewed and better life. One more — of academic work in America — yet remains; should this also prove an illusion, whatever restlessness I have — and with it alas! much of heart and hope — will be spent; and I shall sympathise too deeply with your weariness and cruel self-dissatisfactions, — only, dear friend, without your trust in a regenerative power. The step you have taken,[1] following on Tayler's intended removal, fills me with a sense of loneliness and despondency sadder than I can express. I privately honour your resolve to let no shade gather on your inward truth and power; but in proportion as I feel assured that every year will make you richer and nobler in soul, do I feel that there are no years in which we can do without you, and that an intercalary period in your ministry will be an irreparable loss. For myself, I do not think that anything but your partnership and Tayler's keeps me among the Unitarians at all . . .; and to be separated in lot from you is a thing that seems to threaten all my spiritual relations. God's time will clear many things now dark, but at present I seem to see but a terrible and agitating future. Yours, dear friend, with all love and trust,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

[1] Referring to a temporary retirement from his ministry.

On July 8, 1852, he writes from the neighbourhood of Colwyn to Mr. R. H. Hutton: —

FORYD LODGE, NEAR COLWYN, CONWAY, July 8, 1852.

MY DEAR RICHARD, — . . . The state of the Manchester College question is very unsatisfactory, — like most things connected with the Unitarian interest in England. It is so evident that our London friends (at least the London Committee) are not in earnest about the matter, and care nothing about it, except to be rid of the difficulties and responsibilities on their hands, that every one — even Mr. Tayler — is utterly discouraged; and we begin to think that the only solution of the question will be found in Mr. Talbot's plan, — to let the students get their B.A. degree as they can, and then come to Manchester for their special theological and higher philosophical studies. I believe there is not one of us who is not ready to go anywhere and do anything possible in the interests of the College and the Ministry, provided there be a fair probability of effective support and success. But so long as London presents an aspect of total apathy and sends only the idlest, vaguest statements of hypothetical promise, which no person in his senses can value a straw, it would be folly to expect any good from a removal.

I hear the postman's horn and must suddenly close. God bless you and yours, my dear Richard.

Ever yours affectionately,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On the 27th of October in the same year, after a meeting of the Special Committee, at which every suggested plan had a majority against it, he writes to Mr. F. W. Newman: —

"At Manchester we are again in the midst of the vexed question about the proper destination of our College. In the course of a protracted discussion to-day, it was asserted that the *discipline of the classes* in your College is not in a satisfactory state; and that, as the students cannot be got to prepare their work, the lessons have come to be mere prelections by the Professors. I do not believe this; but nobody was present who could of his own knowledge deny it. How do the facts stand? Is there any unfavourable change? My own wish now is decidedly for the amalgamation of our College and University Hall, the requisite theological department being added.

But we are a queer crotchety people; and what will be the upshot, nobody can foresee. Anyhow, I imagine my occupation will be gone, and with it, any faint gleams I may have indulged of more systematic study and more exclusively Professorial duties, as life advanced."

His anxiety was increased at this time by ill health. Mr. R. H. Hutton writes to him from Barbadoes on the 27th of November: "I left you with much misgiving; your rheumatism, and pale looks, and worst of all, your great pressure of work, . . . made me fear that you may not long bear such intense and continuous labour." It was already felt by those who knew him best that his presence and influence were essential to the future success of the College; and Mr. Tayler, who had always favoured the removal to London, wrote to him, on November 16, that he *must* continue with it, suggesting that he might some time have a chair in University College. The plan proposed to him by Mr. Tayler appeared so obviously inconsistent with his duties in Liverpool as to place it beyond the reach of argument. But he felt deeply the severance of his connection with the College, and the reasons which made it for the time seem inevitable. Replying to Mr. Tayler on November 20, he says: —

"The only office for which I *do* think I have attained some qualification not contingent on the latitude of Lancashire or Middlesex is that of Teacher in Philosophy. And I will not deny that the loss of this function, after the love of it has become confirmed and some ripeness for it has been laboriously reached, has much bitterness of disappointment in it; all the more because I know that I do not deserve the distrust with which, even in this relation, religious prejudice and timidity visit me. But I see that my career in this direction is at an end; and my consolation is that, so long as *you* exercise a paramount influence over our young ministers and laymen at the most susceptible period of their lives, they will catch the very spirit and learn to love the great truths, which it seems to me of the deepest moment to impart." After pointing out the im-

possibility of his acting on Mr. Tayler's suggestions, he proceeds: "Were it otherwise, however, I should still endeavour to undeceive you about the character of my teaching, which is, I can assure you, quite the opposite of your conception, — a conception formed only from things preached or printed. My Lectures are the driest, dullest, least stimulating — often, I fear, least intelligible productions at the time — to which an audience could listen; and instead of frequenting them for six weeks, nobody that could help it would enter the room a second time. And they are more likely to become worse than better in this respect. Yet *to a student, who has time to read and think in the intervals,* I believe they afford the requisite help and guidance and even — if he have the aptitude — some enthusiasm for the subjects of which they treat. Indeed you know as well as I that the fitter such lectures are for the purposes of strict and severe philosophic discipline, the more absurd it would be to pour them out in the hurrying stream of a *spring-torrent.* You plead that such a plan might be a mere *provisional* arrangement, opening the way to something more thorough beyond. Alas! dear friend, I have reached the age when 'ulterior prospects' in this world are necessarily delusive; and to begin, at seven-and-forty, to conciliate 'adverse influences' and stroke the raised back of suspicions that have been idly prowling about for twenty years, — and to do this with a view to remoter possibilities of recognised work, is a thing that I have either too little spirit, or too much, to undertake. The truth is, I fear that our own College is just as effectually closed against a free, though it be a reverential, philosophy as Oxford or Aberdeen."

On Dec. 18, 1852, he wrote as follows to Mr. Thom, who was Secretary of the Special Committee: —

PARK NOOK, Dec. 18, 1852.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — It is perhaps well that an illness which has confined me to my bed since Monday disables me from saying more, in reply to the inquiry of the Special Committee, than is absolutely essential to their further proceedings and due to them in return for the trust they are willing to repose in me. At least the temptation is thus removed from me to complicate the question by adverting to details which should remain over to a later stage of the deliberations. Let me briefly say, then, that, notwithstanding the strong roots which

I have struck here in Liverpool, confirmed taste and that degree of acquired fitness which makes a man love his work, as well as my warm interest in the College itself, would induce me to weigh, with the most real desire to accede to them, any proposals that might be brought before me for continuing in its service as one of the resident Professors in London. Whether the imprudence involved in a removal from a ministerial position such as I now occupy would be too extreme, — so as to add to the necessary sufferings of transplantation, the reproaches of counselling friends and the misgivings of my own inner judgment, — will depend on conditions not at present apparent. I fear that I express myself very ill; but to a vague question only a vague answer will be looked for; and in my present state of weakness I am incapable of saying more or better. Ever affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On Jan. 24, 1853, he replies to some more definite questions: —

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

PARK NOOK, Jan. 24, 1853.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — To begin with the wrong end of your queries; my feeling against a short term of Lecturing is unaltered.

As to the *sources* of my proffered salary; my relation would be *solely to the College*, to which alone I would owe responsibility. With the sources of the College Income, and its means of offering a certain stipend, I have nothing to do.

The History-*Tutor*ship I do not say I would absolutely refuse; unless it were understood to include something more than a mere system of examination and guidance in reading, established on the assumption that University College had already its *Professor*ship of History, but had provided imperfectly for the historical *exercises* requisite for effective study.

But even for this work I feel the greatest distrust of my own powers. And though I would rather undertake it, if it were reduced within the limits of my capacity, than break off altogether from the service of the College, yet the additional responsibility and labour it must involve would greatly and painfully abate my hope of making my own proper department, of philosophy and its history, vigorous and creditable.

Ever affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

We have seen how these preliminary negotiations ended; and after the meeting on the 25th of May he believed that his connection with the College had terminated. In a note to Mr. Thom, June 26, he says: "I believe it to be best that the real sympathies of our body should manifest themselves and have their way. For myself, I throw the whole matter off my mind, and turn back with an accepting heart to the sphere of duty which God determines to be best."

His friend, Mr. R. H. Hutton, wrote to him, on July 12, 1853, calling his attention to an article in "The Inquirer," urging the importance of appointing in the College a professor of Moral Philosophy, who should hold the same rank as the other professors, and suggesting Mr. Martineau as one whose services might possibly be secured. He was about to issue a circular appealing for a separate fund to carry out this object; and, in his letter, he implores Mr. Martineau not to check his efforts by any premature decision. His brother Joseph Henry entered warmly into the plan, and added a note in which he maintained that the College would be ruined if it was to have no additional force of mind and influence to ally with Mr. Tayler's learning, and give weight to the College in London among the more liberal and educated men. To this entreaty Mr. Martineau replied in the following letter: —

TO R. H. HUTTON.

PENDYFFRYN, NEAR CONWAY, July 13, 1853.

MY DEAR RICHARD, — Could you see how completely the world is shut out from me here, you would attribute to me no power for good or ill over any scheme which may interest either church or state, and engage the tongues of a less silent spot than this. No "Inquirer" penetrates to these Celtic solitudes; no Unitarian *quid-nunc* pushes his inquisitiveness so far; and but for your letter received this morning, no tidings probably would have reached me for a month to come of any disturbance to the lull into which College affairs had subsided when I last heard of them. There is no chance, therefore, of my interposi-

tion in any way, unless by giving a *personal* character to the movement, instead of dealing with the general merits of the case, you force me into a prematurely responsible position and oblige me to make up my mind on hypothetical data, lest by silence I should run the risk of misleading others. So long as ultimate refusal remains honourably open to me, notwithstanding the previous withholding of all premonitory signs, I shall be passive in the matter; both because I feel the greatest interest, wholly apart from all personal relations, in the proper vindication of the slighted department itself, and because I always shrink, as from an unfaithful waste of time and strength, from pronouncing on practical questions while as yet they have not become real problems, but linger in the speculative stage. It is so impossible to foresee, amid many undetermined conditions, what may become one's duty, that a contingent verdict is ever dangerous, and to be avoided, if it can, without leaving false impressions. There are already many grounds for apprehension that the full scheme cannot be wisely attempted. Mr. Tayler's consternation (the word is not too strong) at the idea of anything so large; the rejection of it by a legitimate meeting of Trustees; the aversion of the Committee to it, and the doubt whether they would even undertake to open a separate account for it, and administer funds specially provided for its support; the dislike of it by Londoners and the main supporters of the Hall; the resistance to it of Mr. Kenrick and others, who, under the plea of financial prudence, probably conceal a feeling (1) of disparagement of all philosophical studies (2) of direct personal objection; all tend to make the attempt in the highest degree precarious. Without *hearty* support from both the Manchester College Committee and the Council of the Hall, without also the real confidence of the leaders and seniors of our religious body, without *hopeful* as well as friendly welcome from Mr. Tayler, the Ethical Professor would have no chance of real efficiency. To overcome these moral obstacles is less easy than to create the pecuniary requisites. Possibly, however, there *may* exist, ready to be called into activity, a different tone of sentiment from that which has hitherto been allowed to find predominant expression and power among us.

I am rejoiced to find that you have the comfort of Joseph Henry's society for a few days. Give him our affectionate remembrances, and my own thanks for his addition to your letter. I trust that impending events will place him in a permanently satisfactory position. I am reading Maurice's

"Theological Essays," and find them, notwithstanding a good deal of interest in parts, on the whole shadowy and unimpressive. I hardly think a man has any business to write till he has brought his thoughts into distincter shapes and better defined relations than I find in Maurice. He seems to me to have a mere presentiment of thinking, a tentative process in that direction that never fairly succeeds in getting home. But I have thus far read only some half-dozen of the Essays. With kindest regards to Mrs. Roscoe and the loving remembrances of all our party,

Ever affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

In August he returned from Wales, where he had spent his vacation, with some unusual anxiety owing to the cessation of his work at the College and the uncertainty of his prospects. The possibility of his removal to London was already openly discussed, and had actually led to an application for the purchase of Park Nook. Even if he stayed in Liverpool, the reduction in his income seemed to render it necessary to part with his house, for he felt less and less inclined to resume his private teaching. Nevertheless it appears that at this time he had almost made up his mind to stop the movement for securing his appointment to a professorship; for on the 21st of August his friend R. H. Hutton wrote entreating him to pause, and laying facts before him which promised success. The withdrawal of his name would be a death-blow to the efforts to establish a chair of philosophy, and an injury to the public. "I am strongly convinced," says Mr. Hutton, "that you would do better to keep to the College, than in any other course, as far as mere pursuit is concerned. Not that I, *in the least,* undervalue your strong and powerful influence through the pulpit. But your own mind evidently turns so strongly to philosophy; and more than that, your writings will be for all time on these subjects, while in Liverpool your influence will necessarily bear definite proportion to

your remaining years of life. I am clear that it is a philosophical chair to which your own convictions, and I think, your present intellectual tendencies, and I firmly believe the public good, should lead you." For some months the uncertainty continued, and as late as December 26, in a letter to the Rev. W. R. Alger, he speaks without qualification of the termination of his professorship. A few days afterwards, however, on December 29, a deputation from the College Committee called on him, with a resolution, unanimously adopted, requesting him to give a course of Ethics in London during the current Session; asking for an immediate sketch of his plan; and saying that about £250 was at their disposal. Mr. R. N. Philips emphatically asserted that nothing but financial considerations had hindered the adoption, at the first, of the larger scheme; expressed the utmost confidence in the future resources of the College; and declared that the acceptance of the proposed provisional arrangement was a prerequisite to any successful personal canvass, such as the Committee still contemplated. Although Mr. Martineau was able to gather from Mr. Philips's statement that the best feeling prevailed in the Committee, he knew that there was an adverse party among the Trustees; and he was anxious to be assured that this party should not be so strongly represented in the next year's Committee as to render it inexpedient to promise acceptance of more than a temporary engagement. However, he speedily made up his mind to accept the invitation for the current session; and on December 31 he wrote to Mr. R. H. Hutton to consult him about his scheme of work. The later remarks relate to a different subject, but are too interesting to be omitted.

LIVERPOOL, Dec. 31, 1853.

. . . And now, my dear Richard, I want your advice respecting this present Session's work; for though I find it very hard to be flung without notice into a responsibility which I never dreamt of assuming, without preparation, I hardly think

it right to refuse. My notion is to spend in London three days every alternate week, perhaps beginning with first Tuesday in February. I have asked whether the Committee can obtain for me from the Council of the Hall the grant of furnished chambers in the Hall. Then as to Academical Method, it appears to me that there is a broad distinction between the wants of *undergraduates* and those of the advanced students, on their way to their M.A. or to their ministry. For the former the *tutorial reading* of Butler and Paley, with sufficient Prolegomena and critical commentary to give real command of these books, seems to me the proper thing. Examination, analysis, and conversation, directed to excite and test the student's own thought, would constitute the chief business of such a class; which would have no attractions except for the intending candidate for the B.A. degree. It is to the other and higher class alone that *Lecturing* as the medium of systematic and synoptic teaching seems appropriate; and I feel the greatest difficulty in carving out, with due regard to what is possible from week to week, a portion of my subject at once complete in itself during the Session which terminates my engagement, yet duly preparatory for future courses, should they be demanded. In order to avoid needless challenge to hostile prejudice, I would fain work only the historical and critical vein at first, perhaps laying down first the great lines of possible thought on ethical topics; and then resorting to historical examples and developments of each, making them, as far as possible, tell their own tale by mere exposition and mutual contrast without much critical *polemic*, though with no shrinking, of course, from plain indication of one's own point of view. Were I beginning entirely *de novo*, something of this kind would perhaps be the right thing. How far it would consist with good faith to the students who have had their first half of my existing course, and to whom the second and constructive part is due, I feel some doubt; nor is it easy to reconcile the claims of the old and of the new position. You know from experience and present observation all the conditions and wants of the persons and places; and I shall feel truly grateful for your opinion on the whole subject. I had thought of *two* lectures each fortnight, — one on the Tuesday and the other on the Thursday; and perhaps only a single reading, etc., with the undergraduates on the intervening day, giving definite references in both instances, and in the latter case *requiring* these to be read in the interval of my visits, and examining upon them. But without a vacation to prepare, I am at a great disadvantage, and

am frightened at the extent and suddenness of the undertaking; I shall hope for your suggestions before I send in my answer in full to the Committee and they press me for an immediate reply. But if you are not in the mood, do not fret yourself about writing. I will so shape my reply as to leave room for the application of your experience and judgment whenever they are before me. It was an exceeding comfort to me that you were in any way satisfied with the notice of Mr. Newman's new Chapter; as the task had unusually saddened and oppressed me with a sense of its responsibility and its intangible nature. Among the things which, once spoken, it is impossible ever to counteract, low interpretations of what is most beautiful and divine stand foremost; and where the historic ground is so little firm beneath the foot of detailed and special criticism, the controversy runs into a mere unsatisfying rivalry of subjective impressions. I have no doubt Newman thinks me just as arbitrary in moral criticism as I think him; and as for readers on either side, it is always easier, I fear, to fling a shade upon the thought than to restore the light.

. . . . . .

Ever your affectionate

JAMES MARTINEAU.

Notwithstanding these distractions his pen had not lost its fertility. The first number of the "Prospective" for 1853 contained a review of Kingsley's "Phaethon; or, Loose Thoughts for Loose Thinkers."[1] In this, while paying high honour to the humane heart, the devout faith, and the artistic power of the writer, he shows that his thoughts are indeed extremely "loose." His estimate, which is justified in detail, may be summed up in a sentence: "More charming painting and more miserable reasoning, better dialogue and worse dialectic, so strong a flavour of good English sentiment and so faint a trace of any Hellenic thought, it would be difficult to find within the compass of a hundred pages, professing to take their inspiration from the school of Athens."

[1] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological" (2d series), and in Essays, II.

A long review of Bunsen's "Hippolytus and his Age,"[1] under the title of "Early Christianity, its Creed and Heresies," throws some light on the growth of his opinions. He speaks of Baur as "perhaps the greatest of living historical critics." Nevertheless, having described the Tübingen theory, he does not commit himself to all its conclusions. He refers especially to the Epistle to the Philippians, the authenticity of which, he thinks, is questioned "on very inadequate grounds"; and he adds: "In this, as in many other details of the hypothetical history, there is not a little of that straining of real evidence and subtle fabrication of unreal, which German criticism seems unable to avoid." He agrees with Baur against Bunsen, in assigning the authorship of the Philosophumena to the Presbyter Caius instead of Hippolytus, though he thinks the evidence is very nearly balanced. He rejects the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and is of opinion that the question is wholly unaffected by the newly discovered work. He is confident that the Apocalypse and the Gospel cannot be from the same author, and that the former "is incomparably better authenticated"; and thinks that the Quartodeciman Controversy could not have lived a day among a people possessing and acknowledging John's Gospel. If some of these judgments appear to be rather hasty, and to overlook important items of evidence, it must be remembered that these critical inquiries lay outside of his professorial work, that the minute investigation of such points is slow and tedious, and that, amid his multifarious duties, it is wonderful that he found time to make himself so familiar with early Christian history and with the most suggestive treatises respecting it. He points out with great force the evidence afforded by the Philosophumena of

[1] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity," originally in the "Westminster Review" for April, 1853.

growth in the theology of the Church; and dwells on some other valuable thoughts, with which, in other forms, we have already become acquainted.

We have before noticed his review of the second edition of Newman's "Phases of Faith"; and we can only refer at present to an essay on "Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy" in the "Prospective Review." [1]

On Tuesday, Feb. 7, 1854, he delivered his inaugural lecture at University Hall to a full audience. The appropriate subject was a "Plea for Philosophical Studies." [2] University Hall was pleasantly situated in Gordon Square, and, by means of a passage at the rear, was in close proximity to University College. At the back of the building, on the ground floor, was a large dining-hall, which was used for meetings on public occasions. Beneath the window at the end of the hall there was, at this time, a small organ, belonging to the Principal, Dr. Carpenter. In front of the organ was a movable pulpit, from which the Professors delivered their public addresses, and the students of the College read their sermons and orations. Above the hall was a lofty room, with a gallery, which contained the College library, and was appropriated to College use. In front of this, facing the square, was a spacious room where most of the lectures were given, and where was a smaller library belonging to University Hall. It was here, or in the College library, that Mr. Martineau lectured for the next thirty years. The arrangement was that he was to visit London once a fortnight. On Tuesday he delivered four lectures, and on Wednesday two, and then returned to Liverpool by the 5 P. M. train, which at that time spent six hours on the journey. He felt that the writing of his lectures, now much enlarged, put the utmost strain upon his industry.

[1] Reprinted in 'Essays Philosophical and Theological" (2d series), and in Essays, III.

[2] Reprinted in 'Essays Philosophical and Theological," and in Essays, IV.

In the course of this year he experienced a good deal of annoyance from the course of affairs connected with the "Westminster Review." He had been growing dissatisfied with the management, and in a letter to Mr. R. H. Hutton, July 3, 1854, he complains that Chapman is making it "the organ of his own egotism, and ever shifting thought, and not the expression of any consolidated and influential body of competent and consistent opinion." It is not necessary now to go into all the complications by which Mr. Martineau was distressed, and considered himself unjustly treated. It will be sufficient to give his own account in the Biographical Memoranda, premising only that this has been checked by contemporary letters, and that the opening sentence refers to the "Prospective Review."

"From the known opinions of the Editors, this 'Review' has often been regarded as an organ of the Unitarians, notwithstanding its own disclaimer, at the outset, of any such character. In one sense, — and that a most important one, — its aim might be more correctly described as anti-Unitarian; for the great object of its conductors was to prevent the course of liberal theology from slipping into the rut of any Unitarian or other sect, and to treat its whole contents and all cognate topics with philosophical and historical impartiality, apart from all ecclesiastical or party interests. And, in point of fact, this breadth of purpose, while securing it some circulation and marked respect among studious persons in various connections, caused it to be coldly looked upon by the very people it was supposed to represent. This relative incidence of public favour led to proposals, in 1853-1854, to merge it in the 'Westminster Review,' which included much of the same ground; but, instead of this, to the expansion of the 'Prospective' into the 'National Review,' — a separate large Quartery, embracing the field of Literature and Politics, in addition to the scope of its predecessor. This move was preferred, because the tone of the 'Westminster' was becoming more and more uncongenial with the philosophical and religious convictions of the Editors of the 'Prospective,' and they could not, with satisfaction, surrender their function, and transfer their own literary work, into hands that often, indeed, gave valuable help to their main objects, but often also visited them with slight or injury.

"At one moment, indeed, a possibility seemed to present itself of an amalgamation of the two periodicals. In the autumn [summer] of 1854, the proprietor and publisher of the 'Westminster' became insolvent, and the 'Review' — the most important of his assets — passed, with the rest of the estate, to the disposal of the creditors. Had it come into the market, and its value been tested by the offer of sale, a bid for it would have been made by the proprietors of the 'Prospective' with tolerable certainty of considerable increase to the dividend. With other of the creditors, I was of opinion that this regular course ought to be followed. Receiving, however, no notice till the 3d of August, of the creditors' meeting at 11 A. M. on the following day, we, who lived from two hundred to four hundred miles off, had no opportunity of taking part in the proceedings. A balance sheet was laid before the local attendants, from which the 'Westminster Review' was omitted; and, to induce the creditors to forego all claim upon it and leave it in the publisher's hands, a personal guarantee was offered of a definite composition by a friend whose security was perfect. The meeting closed with this proposal; but we absentees, disapproving of the management which had been resorted to, declined to accept the composition, unless a second meeting were called at which a vote should be taken after complete valuation of the assets. Instead of conceding this reasonable demand, the publisher's wealthy patron set himself to *buy off* the dissentients by payment in full of their claim on the estate. I refused to listen to such proposals; but I was left alone; and, as my debt did not warrant me in taking more than a secondary part, I gave no further expression to my dissent than by declining to accept any share in the composition, when it came to be distributed. Some years after, when the insolvent pressed for my signature to his discharge, I qualified myself for duly giving it, by receiving in exchange his surrender of the copyright of articles which I had contributed to the 'Review' during his proprietorship. On this simple story various fictions were grafted at the time; were it not that they are still reproduced, the transactions would not be worth recording. They explain, however, the mode of transition from the 'Prospective' to the 'National Review.'"

His essay on "Lessing's Theology and Times,"[1] in the August number of the "Prospective Review," was written

[1] Reprinted in Essays, I.

under pressure, and is described by himself as "full of faults of all sorts." [1] It is nevertheless a very luminous and interesting description of Lessing's position in the world of thought, and especially of his contributions to theological opinion. His review, in the November number of the "Prospective," of Kingsley's "Alexandria and her Schools," [2] described by himself as "desultory remarks on a desultory book," is too brief to admit of more than some suggestive criticisms. While granting that there is a striking "analogy between the Neoplatonic period of the declining empire and the intellectual tendencies of the present age," he points out that there are no less striking contrasts which may justify the expectation of a happier future. Especially does he dwell on the opposite views of God taken by pagan philosophy and by Christian piety. "We have often thought," he says, "that the doctrine of the incarnation may have been an indispensable means of guarding the Church from this most pestilent delusion of philosophy, — that, to be divine, a nature must not feel. So long as the voluntary adoption of a human life by the Divine Logos is the object of affectionate faith, the disciple is at least secure against the doubt whether there can be care and tenderness for him in heaven."

To the same year belongs a very suggestive essay on "Distinctive Types of Christianity," [3] which was designed to prepare the way for a series of articles on the sects and types of religion in England. Having stated that there is a correspondence between the mood of mind and the form of belief, he finds four chief temperaments of mind, "the quest of physical *order,* the sense of *right,* the instinct of *beauty,* and the consciousness of tempestuous *impulses* carrying the will off its feet." If these severally acted alone,

[1] In a letter to R. H. Hutton, of July 24.

[2] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological" (2d series), and in Essays, II.

[3] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity."

"the doctrine of mere Science would be *atheistic;* of Conscience, *theistic;* of Art, *pantheistic;* of Passion, *sacrificial.*" The scientific tendency has never been provided for within the interior of Christianity, and it is a task remaining for the future to reconcile the opponent influences through the mediation of some more comprehensive conception. The other tendencies were supplied by the genius of the three peoples who met in the early Church; the Hebrew believer contributing his theistic conscience; the Hellenic, his pantheistic speculation; the Romanic, his passionate appropriation of redemption by faith. In the Catholic system these are united, and hence the tenacity with which it keeps possession of the most various types of human character. The Reformation on the continent was founded on the element of passion; and accordingly, when it had taken up and exhausted the class of minds to which it was specially adapted, it found itself arrested. The moral sentiment revolted, and the succeeding century became the period of ethical philosophy. But this gospel of conscience was still defective. It concentrated the perfections of God too much in the notion of his WILL; and it was necessary to regard him "as having, around this moral centre, an infinite atmosphere of creative thought and affection, which, like the native inspirations of a pure and sublime human soul, spontaneously flow out in forms of beauty, and movements of rhythm, and a thousand aspects of divine expression." It is the want of this element that has reduced Protestantism to its state of weakness and discredit, and German pantheism is seeking its recovery. This pantheism must have its place in Christian truth, and settle its account with ethics by a partition of territory: "*Let Christian Theism keep Morals, and Pantheism may have Nature.*" Thus the Church will "complete its triad of Faith, Holiness, and Beauty." The article concludes with a survey of the historical events which led to the embodiment in the High

Church of that *national* sentiment by which the Reformation in this country was distinguished, as compared with the *cosmopolitan* character which it assumed on the continent.

On the 29th of December he preached at Huddersfield, on occasion of the opening of a new Chapel. The sermon is called "Life according to the Pattern in the Heavens," [1] and is founded on the direction given to Moses to make the tabernacle according to the pattern shown him on the Mount (Hebrews viii. 5). From this he draws the lesson that "human worship is the lowly representation, the image refracted through our atmosphere and its sad rain, of Divine Realities." Religion is a surrender of oneself to a Presence real and everlasting. Direct worship is a *conscious* conformity to a pattern in the Heavens. But *all* life, so far as it is good and holy, is an approximation to a Divine image; and even unconscious nature aims at a type which is never fully realised, "so that the whole visible creation is an imitation of the invisible, a copy from a higher pattern in the heavens, a drifting of the material and earthly towards the spiritual and divine." Referring to the special object of the new place of worship, he says: "The Soul of Christ, the sinless, risen, and immortal, is the pattern shown to us; shown first upon the field of history, and on the paths of this living world, and then taken to the heavens, to look down thence on the uplifted eye of faith and love through successive generations."

The last number of the "Prospective Review" appeared in February, and the first number of "The National Review," by which it was superseded, in July, 1855. It is not necessary to record in detail the negotiations which led to this larger enterprise. The general course of events has already been related; and the following letter to the Rev. Charles Wicksteed will give sufficient completeness to the story: —

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

LIVERPOOL, Feb. 18, 1855.

MY DEAR WICKSTEED, — It is a pleasant thing to see your handwriting again, and in the old "Prospective" interest too. I should have sooner told you so, but for a sharp attack of seasonal cold, which has confined me to my room a few days, and prevented my preaching to-day. I have just written fully to Thom, and told him all about "Review" matters. But for your private satisfaction, — or dissatisfaction, — I may say, that the various vicissitudes which obliged us to bring out the February number, and may possibly constrain us to do the same in May, have not induced any abandonment of the larger scheme. This scheme has been under consideration in three successive forms. First, when Chapman's failure seemed certain to throw the "Westminster" into the market, a fund was raised to provide against its surrender to the mere lottery of a Trade-auction, and to secure it as the organ of a serious but free theology, and an English historical liberalism in politics. The "Westminster" was saved from the hammer; but only to be delivered into the hands of a Comtist coterie, and to suffer the defection of a whole group of its most reliable contributors. So next, having both staff and funds in readiness, and in the opinion of experienced publishers, an open field of unrepresented feeling and opinion between the heavy Whiggism and decorous Church-latitude of the Edinburgh on the one hand, and the atheistic tendency and Refugee-politics of the "Westminster" on the other, — we proposed to start "The *National* Review," of which I enclose a Prospectus. W. R. Greg undertook to be Editor, and all was ready for announcement; when through certain misunderstandings or mismanagements Greg lost his publishers, and fearing to compromise his relations with the Edinburgh, had not spirit to begin again with new people, and retired. His lavish notions had rather alarmed us, — and indeed himself; for on quitting the field he advised us to take up a more moderate scheme, — involving less outlay and requiring smaller returns. So now, in the third place, we revert to what in truth was our notion till Greg came in: a 4/: Review, of about 200 pages, — name as yet undetermined; Editor (with aid) R. H. H. [Hutton] at a salary; contributors partly volunteers, partly paid on a certain graduated scale; the whole expense such as to be balanced by a sale of 1250.

. . . . . .

Affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On Thursday, the 22d of June, the Provincial Assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire met at Renshaw Street Chapel, and Mr. Martineau proposed a resolution, that a committee should be appointed to prepare a plan by which the right of voting should be defined, and congregations should have the power of expressing their opinions through lay representatives. This was carried unanimously. In a speech delivered later in the day, on the sentiment of "Our Country, its Free Institutions and Beneficent Progress," he declared that he was indebted to France for very little else than the honour and credit of being an Englishman, descended as he was from a family that was driven by persecution from the shores of France. He did not hesitate to pronounce himself emphatically, almost bigotedly, an Englishman. This prepared the way for a vindication of the more special and limited affections involved in love of one's country; and this topic led easily to a subject of which men's minds were full, — the war with Russia. He denied, on behalf of his country, that there was the infuriate hate which was usually imputed to nations in a state of war. On the other hand, the war had put an end to petty party squabbles, and restored the unity of the nation; and it had drawn them into alliance with a nation towards whom they had entertained the bitterest prejudices. It was gradually dawning on them that it was committed to them as a duty to defend the advancing and progressive liberties of Western civilisation, against the torpid, barbaric, and crushing despotisms which encroached upon us from Asia. "At the same time," he added, "every trust of that nature, of a more limited kind, is ever held in reserve, and under allegiance to the common and universal law of God, and it is because we cannot but see that that law has been offended, because we are convinced that the advance of the power to which I have alluded would delay the triumph of that law, not because we claim everything for ourselves or from our-

selves — it is on that account alone that we have stepped into this dispute." Our physical force must be held in trust, and "as we wield that force in the case of the policeman to control the disturbers of society at home, so we are bound to wield it equally in the case of the police of nations, in preserving the laws of international right." [1]

The same subject is pursued in an elaborate article on "International Duties and the Present Crisis," in the first number of the "National Review." [2] He assumes that the relations and conduct of States are amenable to the same moral law that has authority over the life of individuals. From lack of recognition of this there is an utter want of any coherent principles of political judgment. Even statesmen speak of "going to war *in order to obtain a peace,*" whereas not Peace, but Right, is the proper aim of war. The separation of religion from politics is due to the antithesis set up by the Reformers between Law and Gospel, which removed from the State whatever was sacred, and from the Church whatever was human; and also to the individualism which was encouraged by the Protestant creed. The organism of the world's life, however, is made up, not of individuals, but of nations; and it is not a mere fiction of jurists that deals with States as persons. States, therefore, have duties to discharge, and trusts to protect, which must be defined by the same considerations that are valid for individuals. Accordingly, they cannot escape the duty of protecting others, and it is selfishness for them to withdraw from the ferment of humanity and care for nothing but security and gain. These principles are then applied to the war with Russia, in which our adversary is painted in the blackest colours. He concludes that the object of the war "is to take from Russia the power of further aggrandisement, and the disposition to further menace.

[1] From the report in "The Inquirer," June 30, 1855.
[2] Reprinted in Essays, I.

To keep this one end steadily in view, to rest in nothing short of it, to be tempted into nothing beyond it, appears to us the true duty of this country." As practical measures he thinks that Poland and Hungary should be reconstituted, and reparation be thus made for our guilty neglect, and that the Crimea should be given to Sardinia, at that time the most powerful of the Italian States.

This was followed, in the succeeding January, by an article on "Foreign Policy for 1856." By this time Sebastopol had fallen, and, so far as her military resources were concerned, England was prepared to carry on the war with increased vigour. But for some time there had been a lull in the operations of the armies, and the allied powers were not united in the determination to accomplish a clearly defined policy. In these circumstances Mr. Martineau wrote strongly in support of a vigorous prosecution of the war, especially by a campaign in Poland, which he thought ought to be reinstated as a barrier against the encroachments of Russia. A miserable doubt, however, had settled on the country, whether we had public men in whose hands the character of England and the interests of Europe were safe. Statesmen had ceased to lead, and had no faith in themselves. It was their business, not only to carry out the national will, but to react on the popular sentiment, and mould the very opinions which they obeyed. Over the greater part of Europe two phenomena had become apparent in the previous quarter of a century, — the dependence of social order on great armies, and the increasing power of organised priesthoods. "The Genius of supernatural pretension and the twin Giant of material force recognise each other, and advance to the greeting, across the noble field of the healthful natural life; spoiling beneath their tread the free strolling-grounds of happier years, and driving the herd of frightened nations to be crushed between their embrace." Of these tendencies Russia was the incarnation,

whereas our life as a nation was bound up with that free worship, free discussion, free teaching, free commerce, which elsewhere were objects of official consternation. Thus we had a trust to be guarded for the world; and peace would be unsatisfactory, because arresting us in a European duty on the eve of its most effectual performance.

Between these political articles there appeared, in the October number of the "National," a Review of the Life and Epistles of St. Paul by Conybeare and Howson, and of the Commentaries on the Epistles by Stanley and by Jowett.[1] This review must take the place of the sermons on St. Paul which he decided to withhold from the public; and it is too full of material for us to attempt here to enter into detail. After characterising the three works which gave occasion to the article he traces the historical progress from Jewish narrowness to Christian universalism, which found its full expression and ablest advocate in St. Paul. Basing his judgment on the account in Galatians, he says it is "certain that the biography, the discourses, the human personality of Jesus, were indifferent to him," and that the "twelve were probably much nearer to Gamaliel than to Paul." He denies the existence of development in the Apostle's doctrine and admits only such modifications as were adapted to the altered pressures of the hour. The error connected with the expectation of Christ's return suggests some valuable remarks. It is the infirmity of human nature to translate eternal truth into forms of time. "*Vision* for faith; *prevision* for science: — this seems to be the inviolable allotment of gifts by the Father of lights. . . . The deepest spiritual insight is ineffectual to teach *past* history; it is equally so to teach *future* history. The moment you lose sight of this fact, and expect the sons of God

[1] This article, which in the "Review" is entitled simply "St. Paul," is reprinted in "Studies of Christianity," under the title "St. Paul and his Modern Students."

to *predict* for you, you confound inspiration with divination, and will pay the double penalty of missing the truth they have, and being disappointed at that which they have not." Having exhibited the influence of the Apostle's "antique realism" on many of his doctrines and reasonings, he concludes by asking, what is the significance and value of St. Paul's teaching for us? It consists in the quickening of our vision, an awakening of profounder insight into divine relations, just as, in a great work of art, "the representation may be immortal, when the thing represented has long been historical."

For some time the action of Mr. Dunn, the secretary of the British and Foreign School Society, had excited great dissatisfaction among the Unitarians, who considered his policy to be a violation of the unsectarian principles on which the society was founded. There began to be some talk of an appeal to the Court of Chancery, if all remonstrance proved unavailing; and in order to provide for any action that might be required, a very large and representative meeting of Unitarians was held in Birmingham on Tuesday, the 30th of October, 1855, when resolutions were passed, protesting against the perversion of the primary object of the society; representing that perversion as a public wrong, which it was incumbent on the body immediately affected to repel by all lawful means which were practicable; and appointing a committee to consider and adopt the best means of carrying out the resolutions of the meeting. The proceedings at this meeting were not reported. Mr. Martineau's views are fully expressed in the following letter to Mr. R. H. Hutton: —

LIVERPOOL, Nov. 1, 1855.

MY DEAR RICHARD, — You will think me quite faithless, I fear, to my London arrangements. The fact is, this Birmingham affair became a serious weight on my conscience as the time drew near and I reflected more on its complicated bear-

ings. I thought, and was told all round, that I ought to go; so I altered my classes to the Monday in order to be present. After more struggle and anxiety than I can report, the way seemed at length to clear before me; and I found myself constrained to oppose the course which the meeting has sanctioned. . . . The experiment of *Education of sects in common* was, I think, very properly tried on the biblical basis, protected by absence of comment. Though favoured by the then prevalent reliance on *any*, even mere physical contact with the "word of God" and by the indefinite formulas of a once common theology, and by the unbroken habit of common action among all Dissenters, the experiment *failed*, — chiefly by the inability of the Unitarians, as their distinctive theology disengaged itself and they became a separate body in society, to bear any longer with clear conscience the vague language of orthodox complexion which, at the beginning of the century, they permitted coadjutors to use and used pretty freely themselves. They never objected then (as I can myself distinctly remember) to what we should now call orthodox teaching in the Lancasterian schools; and I believe that the change which has taken place is more in our sensitiveness than in the facts of the case; though doubtless *all* theologies have assumed a more discriminated form, and out of their undeveloped expression have diverged in various directions. The *verbal rules* of the Society, applied to the *present* state of England, certainly condemn the present management; chiefly, however, because it has not adapted itself to the enlarged state of denominational facts, but gone out in the old course amid new conditions. It must be remembered that, though there were individual Unitarians, there was no *religious denomination* of Unitarians when these rules were formed; and the differences which were in contemplation to bar out were those between Quaker and Methodist, Baptist Independent and Presbyterian. Thus a *habit* grew up, which has not expanded itself with the facts, but rather become more contracted. The experiment has been defeated by the force of facts, — has been outgrown indeed; and nothing appears to me more certain than that of all means for bringing about an education in common *now*, the use of the Bible as a reading-book is the least hopeful. Our friends indeed say, "We find no difficulty in teaching out of the Bible; the Psalms, the Parables, etc., the great common principles of Christianity." Yes; but *can a Calvinist* do this same thing, — *make the same selection*, and feel that he is teaching the undertruths of all religion? Say what we will, the two religions,

as expressed and expressible in words, are wholly different and cannot find a common medium. Orthodoxy is not = Unitarianism + an Appendix; and we believe, not *less,* but *otherwise* than they. Firmly indeed do I believe in a *common Christianity;* but it lies in the unconscious aspirations and instincts of our humanity, not in what we *give out* in theological and biblical teaching; and it will develop itself into manifestation more freely if you do not force the differences of conception into shy, restrained copresence with each other, but rather leave human nature to its unembarrassed play, teacher and taught being heartily and wholly in the same element. I am convinced that thus our appointed and Providential way to *unity* is through the *quietude of perfectly natural separation;* and that artificial combinations will only prolong our differences by rendering them more sensible and shrinking.

What plea have we for fancying that we are vindicating the cause of *Education in common? Who joins us* in the call for a restoration? Can we reproduce the combination of Quakers, Independents, Methodists, etc., who surrounded Joseph Lancaster, and induce them to feel that a principle has been infringed in which they have faith for Society? Let this be tried *first;* and if a fair muster of names, having weight with their respective parties, can be brought together, pledged to restore the system, and work it when restored, then I will believe that we do not stand alone. But till then, I shrink from putting in jeopardy a noble institution, notoriously satisfying in the main the great wants it was created to supply, merely to remedy a Unitarian grievance, and *claim* a welcome which, I believe, *cannot* be given. As friends of Education, we ought to be glad to see the work done for others and by others; and rather accept our exclusion as a social necessity than, in even reasonable anger against individual narrowness, hurt or endanger a great working instrument of good. The battle was "successfully" fought at Bristol; with what result? — the entrance of the Unitarian Ministers on the Committee was the signal for five or six Orthodox Ministers to withdraw. So in Liverpool our *United Schools* were the occasion of a civic war for a dozen years, ending in entire separation of the different sects at last. And except for mere business and commercial objects, all joint action of the Unitarians, Church, and other denominations, has been found for twenty years past impossible, and has become quite occasional and exceptional.

Then again, the feeling of our principal men in the North is strong and general against this attempt.

. . . My brother Robert thinks that Birmingham will give no support worth speaking of. Under these circumstances great evils will arise from persevering in the course begun. What I wanted was to have the whole thing entrusted to a Committee of *inquiry*, appointed to *report and advise*. In this way the feeling of our wrong would have had expression at the meeting, and nothing would have been prejudged. Time would have been gained to learn the real feeling of our body; and if the means of advancing further were forthcoming, we might have made a united advance. But ——'s impetuosity precipitated the matter; *full powers* were taken by a Committee *bound to proceed*, and I know not where we shall be. It is impossible not to feel that a multitude of parsons, who do nothing in the matter but hold up their hands, meet and vote away into Chancery the funds of our laymen, upon whom the real burthen falls; and who often are dragged, against or without conviction, into undertakings started by ministers more busy than wise. . . .

Ever affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

In the course of this year he delivered twenty-three lectures to the young people of his congregation on the history and significance of the Lord's Supper. He always felt a deep interest in this observance; and while he fully respected the liberty of those who, after careful and conscientious thought, refrained from joining it, he was grieved that so many should absent themselves through mere neglect and ignorance. The first few lectures were devoted to an exposition of the several accounts in the New Testament; and he then traced the different modes of celebration, and the growth of ecclesiastical dogma respecting it, down to the time of the Reformation. The lectures were then suspended for the summer; and when he resumed them at the end of September, he gave an account of the Reformation, and of the different forms of Protestant doctrine. The last lecture, on the 6th of December, gives a summary of results, and presents his own view. He selects three points in which all the forms of Christianity agree: 1. That the

Eucharist is a rite representing Christ's human life and death, but particularly his death. 2. That the partaker must fix an eye of faith on that past scene, not as simply historical, but as connected with his own spiritual life. 3. That the partaker is richer in divine grace after than before. Speaking of its meaning for those whom he addressed, he says that it is an acknowledgment by the Church of its descent through groups of believers who all found their head in Christ. Thus it signifies that we have not framed our religion in solitude, but have received it as an inheritance from the past. Human nature was, as it were, re-created in Christ; his is the type of character to which we aspire; and in the Lord's Supper we declare ourselves to be of the school of Christ. We also express our relation to one another, and, renouncing our individuality, declare ourselves members of one great whole, dependent on one another, and all in common dependent on Christ as their head. But on the other hand, as Christ is a sample to us of each one's relation to God, he shows us that, besides our union with others in one body, we have each a separate individuality, and an individual, lonely responsibility. Thus Christ occupies two relations to our minds, — an historical, making us all parts of a great whole, and a spiritual, making each a separate individual before God. We celebrate his death in particular, because it was his death which gave him to the whole world as an object of universal faith. His death was the most perfect self-sacrifice, the highest to which we can aspire; and in this recognition we offer ourselves. On the first Sunday of the new year he gave a final address before the Communion Service, in which many members of the class then joined for the first time. This earnest address left a deep and lasting impression.[1]

[1] This account is taken from notes of the lectures written by Miss Gertrude Martineau. The final address is printed, as a "Confirmation Address," in the second volume of "Hours of Thought on Sacred Things," 1879.

1856] INTENDS TO RESIGN HIS PULPIT

Early in 1856 Mr. Martineau had made up his mind to resign his pulpit in the following year. The reasons for this intention, and the results of communicating it to the Committee of the Congregation, are unfolded in the following correspondence: —

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, April 4, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — The enclosed letter was in my pocket when we were conversing together this afternoon in the vestry; but I was unwilling to present it to you at a moment which would have put it into quite a false connexion, or to occasion you any feeling of personal embarrassment during the meeting which immediately followed.

I would only add that, while giving a long notice in deference to a long connexion, I shall be saved some of the pain involved in a separation, if no unnecessary publicity be given at present to the fact of my resignation. I remain

My dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

H. W. MEADE KING, Esq.

Letter enclosed in the above.

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, April 4, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — To you, I believe, as Chairman of the Congregational Committee, it is right that I should address, in the first instance, an announcement, which, at a later stage, must assume a more public form; viz., that it is my intention to retire from my office, as Minister of Hope Street Church, not later than the Midsummer of next year.

I shall then have completed my twenty-five years of service; and so deeply have I always felt the evils of prolonging the same influence on the same spot, when a new generation brings its new wants, that I early prescribed to myself the step now taken. Indeed, it has been in contemplation for some years. But, having been anticipated by my friends, Mr. Thom and Mr. Wicksteed, I felt that it would be unreasonable to quit my post while the impression of their retirement was still fresh. This motive for delay is now exhausted. The last work in completion of the new church and schools is achieved. My quarter century approaches its term. And while a more hopeful spirit will render a more efficient duty in the place

I have so long filled, perhaps matured experience and powers may devote me with increased advantage to other departments of my work in life, and permit me still to share in the great service of Christian truth and righteousness.

At present I deny myself every expression of the thousand struggling feelings with which I announce this resolve.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Ever faithfully yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

H. W. MEADE KING, Esq.

In reply Mr. King referred to a statement which he had made that the income of the church was considerably diminished. On seeing Mr. Martineau's letter, he thought it referred to this; and it was with amazement and deep concern that he learnt its real purport. He had a strong feeling that it was not incumbent on him for the present to impart its contents to anyone. Finally he explains that not he, but Mr. Bolton, was Chairman of Committee.

To this Mr. Martineau immediately replied: —

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, April 5, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — I have to apologise for the inadvertence with which I am chargeable in addressing my letter of yesterday to you instead of to Mr. Bolton. I had confounded together for the moment your relations to the School and to the Church Committee.

Having, however, fallen into the informality, I would leave it entirely to your discretion, on the eve of a change in the Committee, to communicate the letter to the present body or to the new one, as you may think best. If the former, then I apprehend the matter must come before the general meeting on the 13th inst., to which the retiring Committee renders its accounts. If the latter, then the announcement would be reserved for a special congregational meeting, summoned for the purpose at a time agreed upon between the new Committee and myself. In either case I should propose to make the communication to the congregation in a letter more ample and adequate to the occasion than the more preliminary notice which is in your hands. I thought it due to the Committee to open my purpose first to them, and to confer with them as to the proper time and mode of the more public announcement. But the impending

annual meeting and change of committee had not occurred to me when I wrote on Friday morning.

Let me only add that I had in no way misunderstood the purport of your explanation in the vestry; and that, although in itself disheartening, it would have added no very sensible weight to far deeper discouragements. My present step is in any case the mere execution of a resolve that has been taken for many a year, that has already been, I fear, too long delayed, and that is quite independent of any temporary impulse.

Believe me ever, my dear Sir,
Yours very sincerely,

H. W. Meade King, Esq. James Martineau.

On April 7 Mr. King wrote, informing him that he had resolved to keep the letter for the new Committee.

This was followed by a letter from Mr. Frederick Chapple, on April 17, saying that a Deputation had been appointed by the Committee to wait upon him, and asking him to fix an early time for receiving it.

After conference with the Deputation Mr. Martineau wrote the following letter: —

Park Nook, May 5, 1856.

My dear Sir,—I have carefully pondered the many weighty suggestions placed before me by yourself and the other friends deputed to confer with me on the subject of my recent letter to Mr. H. W. Meade King. I have also taken the counsel which I especially desired in aid of my own judgment, and I must no longer delay my promised reply.

Let me frankly confess that the cordial urgency of your representations has overpowered me, supported as it is by assurances since received, that, under the existing arrangement, the College suffers from no inadequate discharge of the duties I owe to it. I certainly thought that my mind was conclusively made up and beyond the reach of change. But I cannot, for the mere look of consistency, act on misgivings which so much evidence has tended to remove, or adhere pedantically to a date of retirement which the guardians of our congregational interests deem too early. I therefore feel it best — at least allowable — to suspend for a season the purpose I had announced.

But after the free and full conversation we had together, it is due, both to you and to myself, that I should add a few words to this bare statement.

You will perhaps remember the three motives to which I referred my purpose of retirement: (1) the apprehension that my work here had reached its proper term; (2) the desire to do completer justice to my collegiate duties; (3) the need of some years of studious labour, in order to execute one or two literary projects, the materials for which would else have been accumulated in vain.

While the *first* of these has been neutralised by your affectionate encouragement, the other two are in great measure inaccessible to such relief. As to the *second*, — if the College expectations are satisfied, my own are not; and the imperfect services I can give are rendered at a cost of fatigue which I cannot hope to be always as well able to bear as I am now. The *third* you endeavoured to meet by several most liberal devices for procuring me the requisite leisure. Of the more considerable of these I have neither need nor desire to avail myself. But I should most thankfully accept a slight extension and completion of my annual leave of absence, which, when really free and uninterrupted, is of the utmost value to me for refreshment and change of occupation. Two months in the summer, undistracted by liabilities to preach in other places as often the only practicable means of finding supplies for my own, would be a genuine relief; and would enable me to make some progress with designs which, during the rest of the year, are laid aside to wait for an uncertain future.

No words of mine can express my sense of the unbounded kindness and nobleness of spirit evinced by the deputation towards myself. But I am even more grateful to them for the frankness with which they recognised the need of some improvement in our congregational organisation. Without any wish for sweeping experimental changes, I believe that many useful amendments may be easily engrafted on our present habits and feelings. And as we all seem to be of one mind in this matter, I shall most gladly confer on the subject with any members of the Committee who may be prepared to enter into the details.

Amid all the doubts that hang over the future, I thank God for the present respite from a most painful step; and only pray that in postponing it I may not, through any personal illusion, have really missed His best time.

Believe me, my dear Sir, with grateful affection,

Yours very faithfully,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

F. CHAPPLE, Esq.

At a Committee meeting on May 7 a resolution was unanimously passed, expressing satisfaction, and promising to do their utmost to carry out the proposed changes. The facts were laid before a meeting of the congregation on May 11; and at a meeting on June 8 resolutions were unanimously passed, expressing regard and affection for Mr. Martineau, and the high estimation in which his ministerial services were held, and extending his vacation to two months, during which the congregation would find supplies for the pulpit. A letter signed by eighty-seven young people was addressed to Mr. Chapple, chairman of the meeting, stating that they could not conceive anything more detrimental to their highest interests than Mr. Martineau's retirement. "It would be to cut off at its source the intellectual, moral, and religious stream of which" they all had drunk. They wished to assure him of their gratitude for his past services, their love for him personally, and their hope that he would long continue among them, to kindle in them new thoughts, and direct them to beneficent ends.

These incidents were closed by the following letter: —

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, June 13, 1856.

MY DEAR SIR, — Your friendly notes received in London contained enclosures too important and affecting to be acknowledged on the instant, or indeed from any other spot than the desk at home, which collects about it so many congregational associations.

I had doubted, you are aware, the possibility of so presenting to the congregation the substance of my recent correspondence with the Committee as to render adequately intelligible the grounds, either of the step I had designed to take, or of its subsequent withdrawal. All the more reassuring is it that, with even imperfect apprehension of my motives, the congregation should have unanimously renewed towards me the expression of their trust and the pledges of their zeal and sincerity. In the noble spirit which animates them I find fresh encouragement to contend with difficulties and misgivings which I have not always faith enough to conquer.

I am truly grateful for the concession of a complete vacation. Such an arrangement — for change rather than suspension of industry — has a value, and even a necessity, which can scarcely be appreciated by those who are immersed in the stirring affairs of outward life. And the invariable usage of Schools and Colleges and other intellectual functions of society in all ages testifies to the irresistible thirst for periodical intermission which arises in a life of much inward strain.

Nothing can be better, I think, than the constitution of the Committee for considering the means of an improved congregational organisation. The elements of it are so various that the felt wants of every class must come to light; and with patience, frankness, and mutual trust among the members, I do not doubt that a practical remedy may be found for most of our social and external deficiencies.

The letter of the young people — as it has most surprised — has perhaps most deeply moved me; and fills me not only with new hope, but with earnest desire to help so much true zeal and affection towards the highest ends of the Christian life. The particular pleasure I have always had in instructing the thoughtful among the young, and the keen sympathy I have never lost with their natural way of thinking and feeling in matters of conscience and faith, render me doubly grateful for any response on their part. So long as my ministry here is continued, no object included in it will be dearer to me than to impart to them whatever I have to give, and to nurture their best aspirations amid the damping influences and the severer temptations of the world.

Believe me, my dear Sir, with grateful and affectionate regard,

Ever faithfully yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

FREDERICK CHAPPLE, Esq.

On the 12th of May he presided over a meeting of the Liverpool Domestic Mission Society, in which he always felt a deep interest. In the course of an address he said he was convinced that it was a fatal mistake to suppose that in going amongst the poor all that was required was a benevolent and Christian heart, a religious spirit, and a willingness for self-sacrifice, and maintained that no natural qualities and no acquired culture could be too rich to bring

to bear upon the elevation of their lot. The Society had justified by its results the unsectarian principle of its constitution; for their minister, Mr. Bishop, now on the eve of his retirement, was widely appealed to as an authority in regard to the condition of the poor, in a manner that would not be extended to a mere minister of a particular sect. The mission had also quickened a sense of the importance of social problems, and was accumulating the systematic knowledge of the condition of the poor which was necessary for their solution.

The Provincial Assembly met this year at Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, on the 19th of June, when the Committee reported in favour of Mr. Martineau's suggestion, that, while all members of the associated congregations should have the right of attending and speaking at the meetings, three lay delegates should be appointed by each congregation, who alone, in addition to the ministers, should have the right of voting. The report was adopted by a large majority. In the evening Mr. Martineau spoke on a congenial subject, "a theology which fears not, but courts the growing light of philosophy and science."

His pen was still busily engaged upon his favourite topics, and in the April number of the "National" appeared, under the title of "Mediatorial Religion," a very interesting review of Mr. J. M'Cleod Campbell's work on the atonement.[1] The article is largely expository of Mr. Campbell's opinions, and, while highly appreciative, points out their inherent difficulty. It might be usefully studied in connexion with the lecture on the same subject in the Liverpool controversy. He complains that the great masters of the Evangelical school are too much at home with the Divine economy. "We must confess," he writes, "that when a teacher lays down the conditions of divine possibility, ex-

[1] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity."

patiates psychologically on the sentiments of the Father and the Son, and seems as though he had been allowed a peep into the autobiography of God, we shrink from the sharp outlines, and feel that we shall believe more if we are shown less." This tendency was due to the doctrine of Mediation introduced by the Protestant Reformers, who constructed "a drama of Providence and Grace, with plot too artfully wrought for the free hand of Heaven, and traits too specific and minute for reverent contemplation." The transference of moral attributes from mind to mind, to which Mr. Campbell objects, but from which his own theory does not escape, is possible only to the realism which treats humanity as the organic unit of which individual samples of mankind are numerical accidents, and is at variance with the fundamental postulates of the Moral Sense. His own view is thus presented: "The Son of God, at once above our life and in our life, morally divine and circumstantially human, mediates for us between the self so hard to escape, and the Infinite so hopeless to reach; and draws us out of our mournful darkness without losing us in excess of light. He opens to us the moral and spiritual mysteries of our existence, appealing to a consciousness in us that was asleep before. And though he leaves whole worlds of thought approachable only by silent wonder, yet his own walk of heavenly communion, his words of grace and works of power, his strife of divine sorrow, his cross of self-sacrifice, his reappearance behind the veil of life eternal, fix on him such holy trust and love, that, where we are denied the assurance of knowledge, we attain the repose of faith."

The October number of the "National" was enriched with a long article entitled "Personal Influences on our Present Theology: Newman—Coleridge—Carlyle."[1] This

[1] Reprinted in Essays, I., and in "Essays Philosophical and Theological." The essay on Revelation in the latter volume is by Mr. R. H. Hutton, and was inserted through a mistake of the Editors.

illuminating essay, so full of delicate and appreciative criticism, hardly lends itself to any useful summary; but a few selections may whet the reader's appetite. Having described the career of Newman till "he raised his Church and Littlemore into a power of the first order in the history of English religion," he speaks of "a small dark speck of misgiving which we can never wipe out. The secret perhaps lies in this, — that his own faith is an escape from an alternative scepticism, which receives the *veto* not of his reason, but of his will. He has, after all, the critical, not the prophetic mind. He wants *immediateness* of religious vision. . . . With men of opposite character, often reputed to be sceptical, doubt is at the top, and is but as the swaying of water that is calm below, and sleeps in its entire mass within its granite cradle." "Sceptical desolation is found to be the best preparative for the shelter of an authoritative church." In the whole influence of Dr. Newman's personality and writings he sees a great preponderance of good. "For the reunion of religious and moral ends, — for the reconciliation of human admirations with holy reverence, — for the consecration of the near and temporal, — many a heart owes a debt of unspeakable gratitude to the literature of the Oxford school." But "their system has too often the appearance of being constructed on purpose as a refuge from doubts they dare not face. . . . It is hard for a proselyte of terror to become a child of trust: and the brand of *fear* deforms the forehead of this party." The Unitarians with whom Coleridge was associated in his early days are described as "a people eminently practical and prosaic, impatient of romance, indifferent to intellectual refinements, strict in their moral expectations, scrupulous of the veracities but afraid of the fervours of devotion," and therefore vehemently antipathetic to Coleridge's genius. The distinction of that genius was the *religious Realism,* which developed itself in the school of F. D. Maurice. Of the

latter he asserts that " for consistency and completeness of thought, and precision in the use of language, it would be difficult to find his superior among living theologians." The strength of his school lies " in the faithful interpretation of what is at once deepest and highest in the religious consciousness of men; and its recognition, in this consciousness, of a living Divine person." But it becomes questionable when it enters history, and identifies the eternal Logos with the historical Christ. As throwing light on Dr. Martineau's alleged individualism the following words may be quoted from his criticism of Carlyle: " All persons, taken one by one, are but elements of a great social organism, to whose laws of providential growth they must be held subordinate. History cannot be resolved into a mere series of biographies; nor can the individual be justly estimated in his insulation, and tried by the mere inner law of his own particular nature." This view is presented, not as the whole, but as " the larger half of the truth." The three schools of doctrine which he has surveyed occupy the most distant points in English religion; but " one thought will be found secreted at the heart of all — the perennial Indwelling of God in Man and in the Universe." To " men with trust in a Living Righteousness, which no creed of one age can adequately define for the fresh experiences given to the spirit of another, . . . and not to the noisy devotees and Pharisees of party," does he " look for the faith of the future."

On this article his friend F. W. Newman wrote on October 28: " Your article concerning my brother amazes me by the inexhaustible fund of patience which you possess, *still more* than it interests me in all other respects. How you *can* read, on and on, disentangling such webs, I cannot conceive. As to Maurice, I am sure that *you* understand him, and on your testimony I believe that there is *in him* a noble and self-consistent religious theory; but that will

not enable me to suspect that it is *my* fault and not *his* that I find him obscure. If he will teach popular duty, it is his task to come within popular comprehension; and he does not."

This essay might serve as an extended illustration of a sermon, "One Gospel in Many Dialects," [1] which he delivered on Whit Sunday at the Centenary of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich. In this sermon he selects, as the three great types of natural mind on which the Spirit of Christ may fall, the ethical, the passionate, and the spiritual, which he finds represented, even in the earliest period, in Matthew, Paul, and John. Speaking of the spiritual he says: "Nature, of her own foolishness, ever goes astray in her quest of divine things; wandering away in flights of labouring Reason to find her God; panting with over-plied resolve to do her work; scheming rules, and artifices, and bonds of union for forming her individuals into a Church." But reverse all this, and fall back on the centre of the Spirit, and "if there were twenty or a thousand in this case, their wills would flow together of their own accord, and find themselves in brotherhood without a plan at all." All three types are blended in Christ, "undistinguishable elements of one expression," for "his divine image is complete in its revelation, and rebukes every narrower Gospel."

In reference to this sermon he wrote to the Rev. W. R. Alger: "Your approbation of that sermon consoles me for the general disaffection which it encountered here, and especially among those who listened to it in my native city. I confess to an ever-growing sympathy with all the great characteristic types of the Christian inner life; and love to seek in them for a deeper unity than Catholicism has ever realised or Protestantism destroyed. But our Unitarians are jealous of any tendency which seems to reduce the par-

[1] Reprinted in "Studies of Christianity."

amount importance of their distinctive tenets; and they look upon such sermons as a sort of treachery or surrender of the party banner." It is only fair to quote the comment appended to the report of it in "The Christian Reformer": "It was eminently characterised by the wide grasp of thought, the profound insight, the large spiritual sympathies and the masterly treatment, by which the preacher is distinguished."

For very many years it was customary at Manchester New College for one of the Professors, in rotation, to open the session in October with a public address, designed, as Mr. Martineau expressed it, at once to strike the true keynote of the studies, and to invite and justify the sympathy of friends. In this year it devolved upon him to speak, and he chose for his subject "The Christian Student."[1] In this discourse we hear for a moment of "critics" of the College, of whom we must hear a good deal more presently; and while disclaiming all pretence that its intellectual discipline was perfect in its shape and distribution, or invariably happy in its results, he maintained that in proportion as these critics rose above the impatient tastes and partial standards of the hour, and apprehended the permanent conditions of the Christian ministry, they would find the more reason to respect its aims and plans. The end for which the institution existed was the training of a body of men devoted to the advancement of the Christian life; and if its founders refused to involve it in the contingencies of doctrinal definition, it was from no want of clear and fervent faith for their own life, but because, in their view, God had more light than was needed for guiding *them,* and the Church of Christ was no completed thing, but "a perpetual protest against evil never vanquished, and a pressure towards a Kingdom of Heaven never reached." The

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

kernel of the life conformed to Christ's was "the living sacrifice," differing from Pagan ethics in this, that, while Pagan self-conquest had been a *self-assertion,* the Christian was a *self-surrender.* The first duty, then, was to select for the service of the Church those only in whom there was "some dawn of God's prophetic spirit, some clearness and depth of conscience, some tender lights of affection, some glow of young enthusiasm, giving fair promise of the coming day." But as religion claimed to penetrate the whole of life, it was the business of the Christian minister to keep it equal to the exigencies of advancing time; so that he wanted the largest and most generous training, and scarcely completed his qualifications till he was furnished with a key to every compartment of human life and thought. Theology was the knowledge of God, and God manifested himself as Agent and Disposer in outward nature, as communing with the individual soul, and as the Providence of collective humanity. In his training of the human race "we obtain a correction of the excessive individualism of Protestant piety, sequestering the private mind with God, and abandoning Society and States to the secular expediencies; and are lifted to the higher view which the Catholic theology contains, but the Catholic hierarchy corrupts, — that our humanity is one vast organism, at once the object and the medium of a Divine and holy purpose." Referring, in conclusion, to his own College, he said: "If there is any class of Christian teachers free to assume this panoptic position, and bound by their antecedents to aim at the hearty and complete reconciliation of philosophic thought and holy faith, assuredly it is the representatives of a body which has never imposed a creed and never feared a truth."

On the 30th of November he preached a sermon on commercial morality, entitled "Owe no man anything," [1] which

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

was published by the desire of many of his hearers. It is a plea for scrupulous honour in industrial and commercial transactions, fully admitting indeed the intricacy of many problems, and the complexity of modern business, which leads men almost unconsciously into a wrong course, but holding up to view the standard of eternal rectitude, and showing that many voices and much time cannot make and unmake right and wrong, and it is not ours to invent our own laws instead of interpreting and applying God's.

On the 6th of October the Rev. W. R. Alger, of Boston, U. S. A., with whom he had had some previous correspondence, wrote him a letter containing some interesting particulars. Shortly before this time Mr. Alger proposed to Dr. Walker, President of Harvard University, that the College should confer upon Mr. Martineau the degree of LL.D. Unfortunately there was a rule in accordance with which the faculty never gave a degree to a foreigner unless he had in some manner connected his name with the country. Were it not for this rule, the President said, "Harvard would certainly pay its tribute to the best theologian and philosopher of England." This was one of many reasons which made Mr. Alger wish to see him in America. Accordingly he adds: "I can secure for you an invitation to deliver twelve lectures before the Lowell Institute, on 'The Philosophy of Ethics,' or on any allied theme you choose." The whole expedition would occupy only twelve weeks, and £300 would be paid in addition to expenses. Mr. Martineau's reply travels over a wider range of subjects, but may be here given in full. The opening sentence is due to Mr. Alger's allusion to his "persevering silence."

TO THE REV. W. R. ALGER.

LIVERPOOL, Nov. 10, 1856.

MY DEAR MR. ALGER, — I know that I am a barbarian in all epistolary relations; yet I am not so hardened against com-

punction as to be impenetrable by such generous patience as yours. I know not how it is, but a certain shy habit of mind, affecting my pen as well as my tongue, has persecuted me from childhood, and made me the worst of companions to friends whether distant or near. I cannot excuse myself, but can only say that my infirmity gains an unfair advantage over a life so rarely freed as mine from the urgent pressure of immediate engagements. After all, — though I say so little, — few things more deeply move me than your affectionate appreciation, — excessive though I know it to be. I will not say I am too old to be spoiled by it, — for temptation is not distanced by length of days. But somehow thought and sorrow and work remove one out of the atmosphere of vanity, and consecrate sympathy to other than selfish ends. Moreover you are not less the faithful monitor than the warm friend, and from time to time try to rouse me to some worthier and larger enterprise than I have yet attempted. Well, I do not know that your encouragement may not add a decisive force to my own purposes, — which often faint in self-distrust. It has been one of my favourite projects to produce a book on the Theory of Morals. I have a good deal of material ready, and doubtless the necessity of preparing a course of lectures by a given time would accelerate the preparation. Dr. Putnam asked me, when he was in England, respecting the Lowell Institute, and seemed anxious to send me an invitation. As I did not hear more of it, I concluded that there were good grounds for the abandonment or rejection of his idea. Whether it would be possible for me, in any case, to absent myself with clear conscience from my post here would so greatly depend on the contingencies present at the moment when the temptation offered itself, that I dare not speak of more than my disposition to give the most respectful consideration to any such proposal as you contemplate. As to the least impossible times, I have often feared I should never visit the United States, simply because my only season of freedom is in the three hot months after Midsummer, which might perhaps be a little extended by special arrangement. But my duties at our College commence properly with October in each year and continue to the end of June. My congregation allow me regularly two months' vacation each year, and are always indulgent to me in case of any unusual exigency. Of the College authorities I am more doubtful; but probably they would not refuse me an extra month or so. Certainly a visit to your great world would be rich in interest to me, private and public; and but for my pressing duties and restricted means, would

have been paid long ago. And as to your friendly desire that I should carry away with me a permanent mark of recognition from your noble University, — how can a man of thoroughly Academic tastes pretend to be indifferent to it? To be an admitted associate in whatever way with the lettered men whose quiet trust is in goodness and wisdom, is the only ambition of which I am conscious. From my heart I thank you for the thought.

I read with lively interest both your affecting papers, — the "Charities of Boston" and the "Literature of Friendship"; and in a cursory glance, preliminary to a worthier examination, at the "Specimens of Oriental Poetry" can recognise at once the graceful execution of no easy task. My eldest son, who is a good Oriental scholar, Sanscrit, Arabic, Persian, and a member of the Morgenländische gesellschaft, has been turning over its leaves with eager pleasure. I fancy that with you, as with us, the most hopeful action on society has come to be, not through church organisation and the direct energies of a sect, but *indirect* and irrespective of the lines which separate religious denominations, through literature, lectures, and academic and political teaching. The Unitarians in their ecclesiastical and corporate function were never so weak and without promise in England as they are now, — to all appearance without a future of any kind. Yet never, perhaps, did they exercise beyond themselves an influence more out of proportion to their small numbers. In truth the old distinctions of doctrinal sympathy are worn out, and nothing but our conservative habits and our church interests prevent the disappearance of many a dividing line and the rise of new and healthier combinations. Your best men who visit us — W. H. Channing, for instance, and Mr. Hill of Worcester — are astonished, I can perceive, at the languid condition of our congregations and will carry home the report (which I am unable to contradict) that we are not far from death. Yet if you were to ask at Oxford or Cambridge, or at Journal-offices of any of the sects, what theological tendency was most encroaching on the elder forms of faith, they would one and all direct you to the faith of Channing and the younger Unitarians. This anomaly arises no doubt partly from the fact that, as a body, the Unitarians remain quite unpenetrated by the newer spirit that has been born among themselves; and precisely that element that has some power in the world is inoperative with them, and regarded with prevailing antipathy.

All England is watching with intense interest and sympathy

the great struggle of which Kansas is the centre. Our domestic and even European questions are almost forgotten in the excitement of the American conflict. Surely, surely, the noble spirit of New England, the rich and populous and educated and vigorous North, will rise in over-mastering power and sweep away the daring projects of a faction which seems to have no superiority of force except its inferiority of principle and its unscrupulous use of the worst passions. I sometimes fear, as I watch social phenomena in Europe and America, lest the higher civilisation should really prove a political weakness, and ruder populations be found to concentrate within them the maximum of strength. *We* shall have to try that problem with Russia and Austria; *you,* with your own South and South-west. In neither field are the appearances very promising as yet; but the time of trial unites a people in proportion to their moral nobleness, and may give an unexpected turn to the balance of conflict. The Kansas struggle appears to me to involve the future destinies of the world more largely than any affair of the present century.

By the way, I ought, before I close, to say that the paper on *Job,* referred to in the "Journal" you sent me, is not mine but *Mr. Froude's.* Happy as I am to be confounded with such a man, I must not appropriate his honours.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Alger,

Ever faithfully and gratefully yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

An article on "The Slave Empire of the West" was written towards the close of the year for the January number of the "National Review."[1] In this he lifts a warning voice against "Southern treachery and aggression," and enumerates facts which prove that "during the present century American slavery has gained not simply area, and numbers, and economical interests, but a more terrible support, — the dominant sentiment of the nation." The politicians of the South had it in contemplation to form a vast Slave-Empire, and to turn the federated continent into a house of bondage. But there was a Nemesis for this insolence; and if it attempted to realise its own predictions,

[1] Reprinted in Essays, I.

the Free States would be driven to separate, and the splendid visions of the rest would vanish in the double retribution of civil and of servile war. He thus describes the immediate prospect: "That the curse should *recede* seems impossible; and the only practical question concerns its mode and direction of *advance*. If it becomes aggressive on the *peculium* of the North, the Union will break; — if on the islands of the tropical seas, foreign war will ensue; — if on the African coasts, *both* these disasters will follow. And in any of these cases it would need a bold prophet to name the next step; but the strain put upon the South would be so great that in some way or other, more or less terrible, the 'Institution' for which the storm was braved would probably have vanished ere the clouds were gone." In a few years, though not in any of the ways here suggested, the United States were involved in the clouds of civil war; and when the clouds had cleared away, slavery was no more. This essay should be remembered in connection with Mr. Martineau's views during the Secessionists' War. Especially we should notice his belief that if slavery is held in by free territories, so that it cannot spread, it must perish through the action of economic causes.

The year 1857 was one of the most momentous in Mr. Martineau's life, bringing him indeed decisive encouragement and warm expressions of trust and affection, but also an amount of personal misunderstanding and opposition which deeply wounded his sensitive spirit, and sometimes extorted from him momentary cries of despondency. The conflict of parties which was fought around him was waged upon a small field, but related to important issues; and it so deeply affected not only Mr. Martineau's own prospects and influence, but the religious history of the body of Christians with which he was connected, that it is impossible to pass it over in silence.

It will be remembered that on the removal of Manches-

ter New College to London, in 1853, the finances admitted the appointment of only two professorships. The Rev. G. Vance Smith, who had been Principal of the College in Manchester, was then appointed Professor of Critical and Exegetical Theology, the Evidences of Religion, and the Hebrew and Syriac languages, while Mr. Martineau had the subordinate position of a Lecturer, and visited London periodically for the fulfilment of his duties. In the spring of 1856 Mr. Smith thought it necessary to place his resignation in the hands of the Committee, to take effect in June of the following year. This step was due to strongly expressed dissatisfaction on the part of some of the students, with which Mr. Smith's gentle and diffident nature did not qualify him to cope. The Committee, after anxious inquiry, decided that the interests of the College required them to accept the resignation. Mr. Martineau's special line of study did not indicate him as a fitting occupant of the chair vacated by Mr. Smith; but several of the most earnest supporters of the College believed that some rearrangement of the teaching might be effected which would make it posible to secure him as the second professor. Others, however, while acknowledging his high character and his great powers, looked with suspicion on his views, and feared his influence. Accordingly, at the Annual Meeting of Trustees in Manchester, on the 22d of January, 1857, it became apparent that there were two parties, and there was little prospect of a unanimous decision. It was proposed by Mr. Mark Philips that the Committee should take into consideration "the practicability of providing for the theological and philosophical instruction of the students of Manchester New College by a redistribution of work between the Principal and the Rev. James Martineau, without the appointment of a third professor." This was met by an amendment, moved by the Rev. Edward Higginson, that a Special Committee, which

had been previously appointed, and had not yet reported, should be reappointed by the General Committee for the completion of their functions. After a long discussion, both the resolution and the amendment were withdrawn in deference to the general feeling of the meeting, and it was understood that the Committee would make the necessary appointments. The meeting was unusually large and influential, and in the opinion of Mr. Martineau's friends the feeling of a great majority was unmistakably in his favour. Mr. Thom, whose powerful and dignified utterance raised the tone of every discussion, made a beautiful and masterly speech, which was recognised as decisive. He afterwards wrote to Mr. Martineau: "My impression is that the result of the meeting, though formally thrown away by want of tact and firmness, must be altogether satisfactory to you as showing that among our laymen, and among any large number of our ministers, there is no distrust whatever either of your opinions or of your influence."

On Friday, the 30th of January, the Committee met. The majority believed that it was necessary to proceed at once to an election, and that the general opinion of the Trustees at the recent meeting was sufficiently clear to justify their action. The discussion turned mainly on the first resolution: "That it is expedient to entrust the theological and philosophical instruction of the College to two Professors, instruction in Hebrew being provided for by the Committee." The Rev. R. B. Aspland, one of the Honorary Secretaries, proposed as an amendment that the subject should be referred to a Select Committee. After a long discussion the resolution was carried by a large majority. Other resolutions were then passed, increasing the salaries, inviting Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau to undertake the duties of the new Professorships, and requesting them "to prepare and submit for the approval

of this Committee, and the Visitors, a scheme for the Theological and Philosophical instruction of the Students of Manchester New College, and for the due provision of instruction in Hebrew." In connection with the last clause, which has an important bearing on subsequent events, it should be observed that Mr. Tayler, at the time, suggested that the duties of instruction in Hebrew should be offered to the late Professor. Mr. Smith's friends rejected this suggestion as only adding insult to injury.

The issue of that day's discussion was eagerly awaited by many who were looking for the growth of a broader and more spiritual theology. One of Mr. Martineau's friends and pupils, the Rev. T. E. Poynting, wrote: "I cannot help writing to you this evening to congratulate you and myself and all who sympathise with the young life rising among us on what I consider the great and most auspicious crisis which has this day taken place in our Unitarian Fraternity." He speaks of the "kindling eye" and "the deep murmurs of sympathy" which accompanied Mr. Thom's speech at the Trustees' meeting, and, with affectionate boldness, he implores Mr. Martineau to cast himself on the Unitarian people "with more generous reliance," assuring him that the young people everywhere, and many of the old, are in sympathy with his deeper and more spiritual views of religion.

It now devolved upon the Professors to prepare a scheme for the future arrangement of the work. In providing for the Hebrew, Mr. Tayler thought it would be a conciliatory measure to nominate Mr. Smith. Mr. Martineau felt very strongly that in existing circumstances this would be an unwise step, and place in jeopardy the future interests of the College; and therefore he was unable to assent to it. It is needless to refer to his reasons; but it is clear that as one of two gentlemen who were preparing a joint scheme, he was not only within his right, but could not

avoid the expression of his opinion. Accordingly, as they were acting together, it was understood that both were debarred from making this particular recommendation. Mr. Tayler also learned that Mr. Smith's own friends were averse to the proposal, and under the twofold pressure he relinquished the idea. This will be referred to more fully in another connection.

On the 20th of February the Committee received from Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau the acceptance of their invitation, together with a suggested scheme of studies. The scheme was referred back to them and to Mr. Kenrick, the Visitor, for further consideration. No recommendation was yet made in regard to Hebrew; but in order to make provision for it, Mr. Tayler generously refused to accept a proposed increase of his salary. The selection of a nominee for the Hebrew tutorship was left to the Principal and the Visitor. The Rev. R. B. Aspland, being dissatisfied with the course of events, resigned his secretaryship, and the Rev. Charles Beard was appointed in his place.

Having accepted the invitation from Manchester New College, Mr. Martineau believed that his future was now pledged by an irrevocable engagement, and on the very day on which the Committee met he wrote a letter resigning his ministry in Liverpool.

The sense of security was soon dispelled. On the same day on which the resignation of his pulpit had been completed and accepted, he heard from Mr. Tayler[1] that a protest against the new arrangements, to which some very respectable names were attached, was in course of signature in London and in the country. Mr. Tayler was so disheartened that he avowed "an irresistible inclination to retire . . . into studious privacy." He had already been

[1] The letter is printed in "Letters, embracing his Life, of John James Tayler, B. A.," edited by J. H. Thom, 1872, II. p. 60 *sqq*.

induced, not without difficulty, to destroy one letter of resignation, and to recall another, and deputations had twice gone to him from Manchester to confirm him in his engagement to the College. Mr. Martineau saw at a glance that his colleague's resignation would produce hopeless complications; and he appealed earnestly to Mr. Thom to use his powerful influence, his "firmness, tact, and vast moral weight," to prevent complete shipwreck. He believed that the opposition would reveal its small dimensions, and die innocuously away. For himself, if he could see that dissension would be saved, and unity restored, by his retirement, he would not hold on for an hour. But such a crisis could not be evaded by mere shrinking, and it brought duties which faithful men might not decline for the sake of peace. It seemed evident that all the elements of their future, the youth, the intellect, the earnestness, even the wealth, of their religious body, were friendly to what had been done, and it was the body of *retreating influences* that was against them. In these circumstances there would be a betrayal of trust and hope in hasty surrender. He had therefore told Mr. Tayler that they ought to give no heed to these movements, but leave themselves in the hands of the College authorities, who might be trusted to defend their own acts.[1]

The language of the protest, which was published in the next number of "The Christian Reformer," is perfectly courteous, and contains no traces of personal animosity. It does not ask for any reversal of the decision arrived at, but simply places on record the disapproval of the recent proceedings of the Committee which was felt by some of the Trustees. The grounds of protest are stated in five paragraphs, and are briefly these: that the Committee came to their decision without considering

[1] From a letter to Mr. Thom, Feb. 22, 1857.

other plans; that the language and criticism of the Old Testament formed no part of the course of the Theological Professors; that the courses on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion were given to separate Professors, and that their instruction in this subject would not secure general confidence, or adequately meet the requirements of students for the Christian ministry; that the new arrangement did not bear out the plea of financial necessity; and that, notwithstanding "the great talents, high character and eminent services" of the gentlemen who had been appointed, there were serious objections to their being the only teachers of theology in the College, for they were "both known to belong to one school of religious thought," and consequently a considerable proportion of the religious body would feel that their views were shut out from a fair representation. This protest ultimately obtained the signatures of about seventy Trustees, including five members of the Committee, and some of Mr. Martineau's oldest friends, — the Revs. Thomas Madge, Edward Higginson, Samuel Bache, Edward Tagart.

Mr. Thom and some others thought that Mr. Tayler took the protest too much to heart, and tried, not without success, to strengthen his purpose. He resolved to make no independent move, but to abide by the decision of a majority. Yet he writes on the 1st of March: "I wish from the bottom of my heart I were at liberty to resign"; and again, on the 7th of April: "Sick and weary as I am of the strifes and jealousies of a petty sectarian existence, I should not be sorry to devote the remnant of my days to the peace and freedom of a studious but not inactive retirement."[1] These words show how serious the probable effect of the protest appeared at one time to be, how great was the tension of feeling among the supporters of

[1] Letters, II. p. 64 and 70.

the College, and how difficult it was for Mr. Martineau to act firmly in accordance with his own view of the requirements of the case. The considerations which agitated him at this time are described, amidst other matter, in the following letter to the Rev. W. R. Alger: —

LIVERPOOL, Feb. 27, 1857.

MY DEAR MR. ALGER,— . . . Mr. Lowell has conferred on me the honour of an invitation to the Institute. But I greatly fear it will not be in my power to accept it this year; though I have written to inquire from him certain details on which the decision may hang,—viz., the precise earliest date at which the Lecture season begins, and the frequency with which the Lectures may be given. Your fancy sketch of the visit is assuredly most delightful, — far more than sufficient to remove every doubt that my *will* can reach. But since I last wrote, a great change has come over my future and altered all the elements of my calculations. I have resigned the pulpit which I have occupied for a quarter of a century, and have joined my friend Mr. J. J. Tayler in accepting the entire charge of our only Theological College, — the Manchester New College, London. The removal to London taking place at the beginning of August, and the Session opening with October, I fear that no visit to Boston could be interposed, even though a little slice were stolen from October to make more room. The circumstances under which the new office devolves on me preclude me from asking for any unusual privilege. The delivery of the College into our hands marks a theological crisis in our body; and though carried by an overwhelming majority, containing the chief elements of our future, — our youth, our culture, and even our wealth, — is disliked and resisted by a highly conscientious and respectable minority, attached to the elder Unitarianism, and suffering from *Germanophobia.* With a little patience and tenderness towards honest scruples and mistrusts, the air will soon clear again; perhaps to be brighter than before. But meanwhile the time demands a peculiar fidelity, and is not seasonable for any special license.

You may suppose that no slight struggle is involved in this retirement from the active ministry among an attached people and amid the fairest surroundings of Church and Home into a much poorer and less honoured lot in the heart of the great Metropolis. All judicious critics are sure to wonder at me and condemn; nor have I any reasons that would stop the shaking

of such wise heads. But somehow an irresistible sense of a Providential meaning in this opportunity has possessed me. To go seemed to solve many public difficulties and to entail only private inconvenience. To stay seemed safer on grounds of narrow prudence; but might have opened an endless tangle of public difficulties, and would have thrown back into despondency the best spirit of the rising time amongst us. Studious work, too, is congenial to me; my colleague is a thoroughly like-minded and most accomplished friend; with the student-class I have peculiar sympathy, and to spend the remaining years of active life in preparing from among them faithful guides of the next generation seems no unworthy outlay of one's experience.

. . . . . .

W. H. Channing returns home in August; — carrying with him hence the universal affection of his English hearers and neighbours. Rarely have I found so faultless a heart, so trustful a soul, or a mind so purely yearning for truth and good.

Believe me ever, dear Mr. Alger,

Most faithfully and heartily yours,

James Martineau.

The members of the Committee, though less painfully, were more immediately implicated in the protest than the Professors; for it was the propriety of their proceedings which was challenged. They of course determined to stand loyally by the men whom they had deliberately chosen; and on the 4th of March they issued a circular begging the Trustees to suspend their judgment till they received a Special Report which the Committee intended to send to every Trustee, containing "an authentic and accurate statement of its proceedings, and the present position of affairs." Letters of encouragement were dispatched to the Professors, assuring them of the earnestness with which they were supported. The desirability of summoning a general meeting of Trustees, to pass a vote of approbation or of censure on the Committee, was at this time left undecided. Mr. R. N. Philips was strongly in favour of this course. His vigorous liberalism was roused

by what had taken place, and he wrote to Mr. Martineau: "I bitterly regret the narrow-minded feeling of our body. I am sure the sooner we bring the matter before the whole body the better, and let those who hate and envy you and call themselves Christian ministers show themselves in the true light. We all feel deeply for you and your family. It is not our fault you are persecuted. Persecution, it seems to me, will last for ever, and cant and humbug dwell with it." These words show that feeling was beginning to reach a dangerous temperature; for it would be unjust to suppose that many of the protesters were moved by hatred and envy. Some of them had signed with great reluctance, and even the persecutor, however mistaken, may act under a sense of duty. Mr. Thom, who at this time was staying at Torquay, was strongly opposed to summoning a special meeting. He thought the protest was a breach of contract; for the Trustees would have decided the question at their meeting in January if some of the protesters had not pleaded that the whole question should rest with the Committee. They were now protesting against the decision of the tribunal of their own choice; and if the Committee called a meeting, they would say that that was not *their* doing; their protest was to deliver their own souls, and was not intended to have any further action. To call a meeting, then, would be playing *their* game, whereas, if they were left alone, the whole affair would dwindle and die away. This opinion was likely to prevail when, on the 12th of March, a step was taken by the Committee which seemed to Mr. Martineau to give a new and unexpected authority to the protest. The Committee was largely attended, and almost unanimous in adopting the amended scheme of studies and the Special Report which was to be issued to the Trustees. Mr. Aspland declared that he looked upon the steps which had been taken as irrevocable, and professed himself sincerely anx-

ious that they should result in the good of the College. The protest was looked upon as a final act; and one of the Secretaries, the Rev. Charles Beard, wrote enthusiastically to Mr. Martineau, congratulating him on the termination of the protracted hostilities. But he did not mention that the protest had been received, and entered on the minutes. As soon as Mr. Martineau heard of this, he felt that an official importance had been given to the protest which it had not previously enjoyed, and that nothing but a public vote of confidence could now justify him in maintaining his position. At the same meeting two of the protesters had requested the Committee to take a poll of the Trustees by circular, and, in thus asking them to break an engagement which was publicly known to be complete, indicated a confidence in the general feeling which made the opposition too formidable to be treated with neglect. So firmly was Mr. Martineau convinced of this that on the 17th of March he wrote to Mr. Thom that he had lost confidence in the executive, the one only reliance which he had felt to be secure, and that if, as he anticipated, Mr. Tayler agreed with him, they would place their offices at the disposal of the Committee at once. He was entreated to pause, and assured that the placing of the protest on the minutes had no significance, but simply complied with the custom of entering whatever was read before the Committee. He seems now to have stood almost alone; for even those of his supporters who were most confident that the weight of public opinion was on their side were doubtful of the result of a meeting which the opposition might make a point of attending in force. Even his friend Mr. Thom, while deeming the reception of the protest by the Committee "monstrously absurd," did not think that it had thereby acquired "the slightest new weight or significance." However, he remained firm in his conviction that the protest was a warning notice of future opposition,

and the beginning rather than the end of strife; and although his colleague was of a different opinion, and would not join in his action, he wrote on the 31st of March to the Rev. W. Gaskell, the Chairman of the Committee, recalling the circumstances of his engagement, and the existence of a protest whereby a doubt was raised which needed to be set at rest by distinct and positive evidence. He therefore prayed the Committee to dissipate all doubt by convening a special meeting of Trustees, or else to relieve him of a task which had lost its conditions of security and success. The Committee met on the 3d of April, and passed a resolution that a special meeting of Trustees should be held in Manchester on Thursday, the 16th of April, at 12 o'clock, "for the purpose of receiving and adopting, or otherwise, the Special Report of the Committee, dated the 12th of March, 1857." At the same time, in order to obviate any mischievous results of their previous action, they adopted a resolution declaring that the protest had been placed upon the minutes as an historical record of the opinion of Trustees, and with a view of conciliating the feelings of a minority of the Committee, and that it was not to be construed into a precedent.

Mr. Martineau's state of mind, and the reasons which determined his judgment, are indicated in the following letters: —

TO REV. C. BEARD.

LIVERPOOL, March 19, 1857.

MY DEAR SIR, — . . . I am fully convinced of the firm resolve prevailing in the Committee to uphold the arrangement which their Special Report so ably vindicates. Were the moment less critical, I should leave everything with entire trust in the hands of others. But we are at a juncture which may attach heavy penalties to the slightest mistake; and to refrain from noting the signs and sources of danger would hardly be faithful. The impression now sedulously circulated through the country is this: that the Committee has perpetrated a high-handed act of Executive power, legitimate in form, but at vari-

ance with the predominant wish of their constituents. This is honestly believed by a vast proportion of the Trustees, — even of those who themselves would approve of the arrangement made. To this prevalent belief we have *absolutely no producible fact to oppose;* and the Protest with its seventy names has the whole visible field of the *constituency* to itself. It is useless appealing to the feeling of the last Annual Meeting, for it was not put to the test of a vote. . . . Since that opportunity of testing the outside feeling was missed, the Committee has acted on its own responsibility, manifesting the utmost energy, tact, and temper, and the fullest *assurance* of enjoying the public confidence; but still with no available answer to the charge of totally mistaking the wishes of the constituent body. The taunt implied in the demand of Mr. —— and Mr. ——, that the Committee dare not poll the Trustees, is surely not of a kind safe to be left without any reply, and with the whole *show* of force on its side. A reader of the Minute-book fifty years hence could find no evidence that an unwelcome plan had not been thrust down the throats of the Trustees by a small but resolute Executive.

. . . . . .

The very *dangers* said to be incident to a further appeal affect me as confirming proofs that the step should be taken. If the requisite moral force for sustaining the Committee's plan cannot be produced and exhibited with an emphasis sufficient to discourage disaffection, the plan wants security of base, and may be undermined by the persevering drip of hostile criticism. The Committee occupies the most powerful vantage ground; its right is unimpeachable; its measures most conscientiously taken and now most efficiently expounded and justified; its plan no longer a *project*, but *un fait accompli;* its opponents in a false and unconstitutional position; the Annual Meeting, whence everything sprung, still recent and susceptible of only limited falsification.

If, with these advantages, an overwhelming sanction cannot be got, it can only be because the protesters, and not we, have correctly estimated the feeling of our body. In that case, the sooner we know the fact and succumb to it, the better.

Ever, my dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

TO REV. W. R. ALGER.

LIVERPOOL, April 3, 1857.

MY DEAR MR. ALGER, — I fancy you must have heard from me immediately on the dispatch of your letter of the 13th. My note, however, contained nothing requiring an answer; but it has, I trust, informed you more exactly of the posture of affairs here than the scanty notices in the "Inquirer."

Let me, however, first clear my conscience by a distinct answer to your inquiries. I fear that a miscellaneous collection of my papers,[1] such as you propose, will be too deficient in unity to form a really serviceable book, and will put to severe test the *consistency* in which sober-minded critics say I am quite wanting. However, if you and others think there is any good to be done by a volume so made up, all its elements are at your disposal. For sympathy from like-minded men I care, perhaps, too much; for mere reputation, the least possible, and not at all for reputation against or without facts. So, if I contradict myself, let it all come out; it will but make the need usefully felt of the inner middle term which is to harmonise the opposites. I am amused at your proposing to wind up with my youthful sermon, "Peace in Division." But to "acknowledge the sins of one's youth" is an indispensable part of the penitence of age; and so I will stand at the Church door in any white sheet that you choose to put upon me.

. . . . . .

As to the Transatlantic visit, I still know not what to say. The only fixed point as yet discernible in the near future is, that we leave Liverpool; my congregation having been resigned and my house sold on the first acceptance of my London post. Since that time, however, such a theological uproar has been raised by the Old-School men about the appointment of Mr. Tayler and myself, that it has become necessary to put to the test the real feeling of the supporters of the College; and I do not intend to enter upon my new duties unless assured, by a distinct vote, taken at a meeting convened for the purpose, that a hearty confidence is reposed by the constituent body, as well as by the Committee, in the new plan and the new Professors. Upon the issue of that meeting much will hang; — not a little as to the future of our religious body in

[1] This refers to "Studies of Christianity," brought out in the following year by Mr. Alger.

England; — still more as to the remainder of my own life. Should the new arrangement be powerfully confirmed, it will fix me henceforth in London to very congenial work. Should the arrangement be disapproved, the decision will amount to a vote of expulsion on the score of heresy from our religious connexion in England; and, in that case, I know not whether I may not appear as a suppliant for asylum in the New World. The crisis is in reality much more serious than could be gathered from any public symptom; for our English reticence keeps back a great deal. The old Unitarianism is already struck with inevitable and visible death; and the question simply is, whether it will take up or whether it will throw off the young life intellectual and spiritual which is ready, if permitted, to accept its consecration from the elders' hands and make no breach of succession, but which, if rejected and disallowed, will disperse itself for action among other churches, where Faith and Love are strong and Thought itself more truly catholic.

I have read with deep interest your graceful tribute to Dr. Kane. The pride of a nation in such a man is surely one of God's benignest inspirations, — on a small scale, a very religion, pure and undefiled.

Ever, my dear Mr. Alger,
Yours most faithfully,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

LIVERPOOL, April 6, 1857.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — You will have seen by this time, through the College Circular, that my misgivings are to incur the responsibility of a Special Meeting. It has been with the greatest reluctance that I have pressed this matter beyond the line at which several of my best friends would have had me rest. But there was no peace for me or hopefulness of spirit, without putting an end to the indeterminate state in which facts at present lie. And even could I have been guided by opinions, they were greatly divided, even in London, notwithstanding Tayler's report, given from his partial means of observation. His impressions are derived very much from a particular coterie, influenced by the London members of the Committee, at whose instigation the Protest was put upon the minutes. They do not know the spirit which animates a certain resolute section of the protesters, and which finds in every part of the

country agencies to propagate it. Quite agreeing with you that everyone present on 22d January at Cross Street was in honour bound by the Committee's proceedings, I see that the obligation is not acknowledged, and is in fact destitute of all reliable operation. The responsibility of calling people from all parts of the country on such an occasion is serious and oppressive to me. But nothing short of this, I am persuaded, can rescue the College, and even our whole religious body, from ruinous dissensions and uncertainties for years to come. If the arrangement is disallowed and I am removed, I cannot but accept the decision as an expulsion from our religious connexion in England, and seek a home in America before the autumn closes in. If the arrangement is confirmed, the meeting which pronounces in its favour may exercise — if it be sufficiently emphatic and high-toned — a decisive and beneficent influence over our whole ecclesiastical future; scaring conclusively away into holes and corners whatever is mean and narrow; calling out into hope the young spirit of a better time; and pledging the manly honour of our laymen (even where they are indifferent to all theological issues) to maintain open the course of religious development and unarrested learning. You see, dear friend, what I would be at, all this will chiefly depend on *you;* without whom the meeting, however composed and organised, would want *its soul.* You are at a horrible distance from Manchester, and may well feel savage at my disturbance of your repose. But though I am the accidental occasion, the real stake is something far greater, involving indirectly the well-being of our inherited trust as a distinctive section of the Christian Church. With the numbers and attendance at the meeting I shall in no way concern myself, leaving the matter altogether in the hands of the Committee. But seeing how very much may depend on its spirit, I cannot help expressing an anxiety for just the one thing needful to secure its right tone. . . .

With kindest regards to Mrs. Thom,

Ever, dear friend,

Affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

In reply to the last letter, Mr. Thom expressed his determination, at whatever inconvenience, to be present on the 16th. But he greatly regretted the necessity for open conflict, and feared that victory, on whichever side it might

be, could not be without wounds and scars. "Indeed," he says, "one of the things that perplexes me most is how to deal with such an occasion, — and whether one ought to repress the unmeasured reprehension which would be the natural way of treating the protesters. The mildest words, that only truly reveal the nature of the case, must be severe, and must be felt to be such."

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

LIVERPOOL, April 13, 1857.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — This is indeed a cruel wrench, to tear away, not only yourself, but Mrs. Thom from your retreat, before the spring has opened its clear skies upon you, and fling you into our Northern storms again. I cannot resist the temptation to send a few words to meet you at Birmingham; though I have really nothing more to communicate or suggest about the meeting on Thursday. I hear from my brother-in-law at Wakefield that — against *his* wish and advice — the protesters have determined to attend in force and maintain their ground; and he writes to me to deprecate my surprise at his following his party, public duty requiring that they should act together. It is evident, therefore, that there will be a trial of strength.

It is late now to speak of the question whether this meeting was called for by the exigencies of the case. But I naturally shrink from the responsibility I incur, when its justification is rested merely on the *fact* of my personal apprehensions; and feel anxious that those apprehensions should not appear quite gratuitous and unreasonable. I think Mr. ——, whose former opinion was against *the Committee originating* a meeting *on their own account* and taking the initiative in *suggesting insecurity,* is now fully convinced of the sufficiency of the grounds on which I have acted. When he gave his first opinion . . . , the Protest had not been put upon the Minutes; and Mr. —— had not demanded a poll of the Trustees by circular. The character of this last step seems to me, I must say, to justify any degree of distrust I might feel in the honour of the minority and the consequent repose of the arrangement. . . . Most truly do you say that the simplest statement of facts in this case involves inculpations most painful to make. I only dwell on this point now, in order to excuse my feeling of uneasiness and insecurity, notwithstanding the perfect regularity of all pro-

ceedings, and my entire confidence in the existing Committee. How could I help fearing that there were opponents who, under the influence of theological antipathy, regarded no engagement as conclusive, and who were confident of support (else they would not have sought a poll) from the great body of the Trustees? I have not in my heart (if I know myself) the slightest *personal* anger in this matter, and should rejoice to see the needful stability secured at the smallest cost of disquiet. But I certainly think it is due to the public moral sense, that confused and passionate conduct should be brought out into the clear light and seen to be precisely what it is.

The supporters of the College were now thoroughly roused, and everyone felt that a decisive conflict of principle was at hand. On the 9th of April the Rev. T. E. Poynting issued a printed letter to the Trustees, calling attention to the importance of the crisis; indicating the principle in accordance with which the College selected its teachers, paying respect only to their learning, ability, and moral and religious character, while ignoring the distinction of peculiar schools; and finally declaring that the objection which had been raised rested on a misconception of the Professors' views. Mr. Edwin W. Field, the well-known lawyer, saw most clearly the issue which was involved, and wrote to his friends, urging them, at whatever inconvenience, to attend the meeting. His opinion has the greater weight, because he avowed himself "by no means a Martineauite, but an old-fashioned Priestleyite." He took the constitutional ground, and deemed it to be irrelevant to ask whether the Committee had judged rightly or wrongly in the selection which they had made. The Trust required the funds to be distributed only as a majority of *Trustees assembled* at a meeting should determine, or should appoint a Committee to determine; and if these protests *ab extra* were to be fired off at their acts, the concern would be blown up and destroyed. He says: "It is, I think, clear the Committee could not listen to imputa-

tions as to creed. . . . The matter is vital beyond doubt, independent of the distressing personal bearings of the question." He fully approved of Mr. Martineau's action, and greatly regretted that Mr. Tayler had not joined with him in his letter to the Committee. The Rev. Dr. Sadler also, though not a Trustee, wrote a letter which derived weight from his high character and the reverence in which he was already held. Speaking of Mr. Martineau as a teacher, he says: "Of all the Professors, either in this country or in Germany, whose lectures I have had the privilege of attending, I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion not one combines in either greater measure or greater number the highest qualifications of a teacher." He speaks of the approaching discussion as "of vital importance to our body," and concludes thus: "The battle of religious freedom, I am afraid, will have to be fought in every generation, for impatience of differences appears to be an infirmity of *human nature;* but I hope this infirmity will never manifest itself in our body in the same way in so many individuals at the same time, as really to endanger the catholic position which I believe has been especially committed by God to our charge."

The crisis appeared to Mr. Martineau to have an importance extending far beyond any personal interest. On April 6 he wrote to Mr. Beard: —

April 6, 1857.

It appears to me a rare and priceless opportunity for driving into holes and corners whatever is poor and narrow-hearted in our Church spirit, and calling out into hopefulness the young spirit of a better time, and committing the honourable sympathies of untheological laymen to the interests of open learning and continuous religious development. This larger aspect of the meeting so eclipses my personal relation to it, that I almost long to be free and in your place, in order to help the occasion to its proper results. This is, however, only the restlessness of one accustomed to action; not the slightest misgiving as to the vigorous and skilful management. I leave everything with

perfect trust in the hands of yourself and coadjutors. And be the result what it may, I shall never cease to feel that every human justice has been done to the attempt, and that the issue must be accepted as Providential.

As the day approached he could not avoid some natural misgivings, and on April 10 he wrote again to Mr. Beard: "I feel not at all sanguine about the result. But I am prepared either to go to work or to be sacrificed, as may be appointed to me; and shall make no moans and utter no reproaches, come what may."

On the appointed day one hundred and forty-one Trustees, of whom one hundred and seven were laymen, assembled from various parts of the country in Cross Street Chapel, Manchester. In the absence of the President, Mr. Meade King was appointed Chairman. Mr. Mark Philips moved "that this meeting, having received the Special Report of the Committee, dated 12th of March last, as to the measures adopted by them in relation to the Professorial arrangement of the College, testifies its unabated confidence in the Committee and its full acceptance of those measures, and hereby formally adopts the Report." This was seconded by Mr. Thom with his usual power and eloquence. Mr. George Long then moved, as an amendment, that the Committee be instructed to take steps to ascertain by circular the wishes of every individual Trustee. He maintained that that was the only way in which such an important question ought to be decided, and that "some of the opinions advanced in the writings of the two Professors were not of a character to promote religion or increase the influence of Christianity in the world"; and he further objected to "the obscure and mystical style in which they were accustomed to clothe their ideas." This was seconded by Mr. E. Bowman, whose chief contention was that the Special Report did not give an "accurate statement of the Committee's proceedings and of the posi-

tion of affairs." After a prolonged debate, in which some of the protesters strongly disclaimed the charge of being false to "their foundation principle of religious liberty," a division was taken, when, after the amendment was negatived, the votes for the resolution were 113, against 17, giving a majority of 96 in favour of the Committee's arrangements. Letters from Trustees who were unable to attend took the same side in the proportion of 22 to 2. Two other resolutions were passed, which ought to be recorded: 1. "That the official recognition of Protests tends to weaken and render unstable the government of the College, and that such documents should not in future be recorded as part of the College minutes." 2. "That this Institution is founded for the sole purpose of giving University learning to students for the Christian ministry among Non-subscribing Dissenters, without test or confession of faith, and not for the purpose of instruction in the peculiar doctrines of any sect; and that in appointing Professors it would be a violation of this fundamental principle to attempt to secure a representation of the views of any particular school of thought." In supporting the latter resolution Mr. W. Shaen emphasised the fact that the Institution "was not and ought not to be made a Unitarian College, but a College of Free Theology, standing upon the broad principle of non-subscription."

After the meeting some fifty or sixty of the Trustees dined together at the Queen's Hotel, and it is related that they "passed a very pleasant and harmonious evening." The toast of the new Professors was received with the utmost enthusiasm.[1]

Among the many gratifying letters which Mr. Martineau received after the decisive vote which gave him henceforward an assured position, must be mentioned one from

[1] The proceedings are fully reported in "The Christian Reformer," 1857, p. 312 *sqq.* and 379 *sqq.*

Mr. John Dendy, conveying an address from twenty-seven of his former pupils. The address, though not forwarded till the 21st of April, was composed, and the signatures were obtained, before the meeting. It indicates the affection and trust which he inspired in his pupils; and his reply explains, and implicitly defends against the recent objections, his aims as a teacher.

To the Rev. James Martineau.

Dear Sir, — In the present critical position of Manchester New College, more especially with regard to your own services as Professor, we think it right, as your former pupils, to express the respect and gratitude we feel towards yourself, and our regret at the embarrassing circumstances in which you have been placed. We know from experience something of the value of your instructions. We thank you most deeply and sincerely for the admirable guidance which you have afforded us in many departments of difficult intellectual inquiry. But we cannot limit ourselves to the acknowledgment simply of an intellectual obligation. It is our duty, also, to bear testimony to that devout spirit of Christian faith, and that earnestness of Christian conviction, which we have continually recognised as forming the groundwork of your instructions. In our opinion, there can scarcely be any teaching more valuable to students of theology, or more in harmony with the requirements of the age, than that which, like your own, exhibits the union of deep and original research with a truly reverential spirit, and is devoted, above all things, to the vindication of our common faith.

It is for these reasons that we most earnestly desire that the benefit of your instructions may be continued to the present and future students of the College. Having heard with great pleasure of the appointments recently made by the Committee, we cannot but express a hope that they may be fully and consistently carried out, and that you may now consider yourself enabled, without scruple, to accept the duties which thus devolve upon you. We feel confident that such an arrangement is well calculated to promote the future prosperity of the College.

We remain, dear Sir,

Gratefully and affectionately yours,

[*Here follow the signatures.*]

Reply.

My dear Mr. Dendy, — On my return home after a few days' absence, I find the address of sympathy and confidence in which many of my former College pupils generously interpose to lighten the difficulties of my new task. Such an expression of regard is among the most precious fruits of laborious years. Proceeding as it chiefly does from men no longer inexperienced in life, and occupying or sure to occupy positions due only to character, knowledge, and capacity, its testimony has an intrinsic value beyond its deep interest to the Teacher's memory and affection.

At the same time, I am profoundly conscious that this friendly estimate of my past work is true rather of its aim than of its performance; of whose manifold deficiencies I could too sincerely speak, did not the discussions of the recent crisis render such words unseasonable and superfluous. Time alone can show whether I delude myself with the hope of better realising my own conception under the new conditions of daily devotion to the academic work, and the constant counsel and sympathy of my accomplished senior colleague. But, thus far, the only credit I can take to myself as a Teacher is, for an honest desire to be always just to the sentiments of others, and ingenuous in the statement of my own; to respect the independent working of the student's mind, and never transgress the limit that separates guidance from dictation; to conceal no difficulty, to shelter no fiction, but encourage a simple and reverential trust in whatever God has made real or has set forth as true and good.

Hitherto it has not devolved upon me to conduct any portion of the special studies for the Christian ministry. Henceforth it will be otherwise. And no change could be more congenial to my deepest faith and affection than that which enables me to enter the sacred circle of Christian doctrine, and to share more directly in sending forth faithful men, well furnished as preachers of Christ's holy Gospel, and pioneers of his heavenly kingdom.

If I do not mistake the signs of the times, many threatening clouds are passing away from us; and with candid interpretation and hearty support of one another, we may hope for a blessing on the future, not unworthy of the good examples of the past.

I pray you to convey my affectionate acknowledgments to

the friends whom you represent, and to believe me, dear Mr. Dendy,

Ever faithfully yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

LIVERPOOL, April 24, 1857.

The following letters throw a further light upon his feelings and hopes: —

TO REV. C. WICKSTEED.

APRIL 23, 1857.

MY DEAR WICKSTEED, — I feared you would be angry with me for calling a General Council, instead of being content with the decision of the Curia at Manchester; and all the more thankful am I to have your forgiveness, as well as your congratulations, on my effectual purification from the taint of heresy. Almost all the friends on whose judgment I am accustomed to rely dissuaded me from the step I took; and I was not blind to its inevitable hazards. But the conviction remained with me that in courage only was there safety; and that what danger there was would not be created, but only exhibited, by the meeting, — and would do less harm when brought to the daylight than when lurking in the dark. To act on this conviction against the wish of my most trusted advisers involved a very painful responsibility; and the general admission which now reaches me that the meeting has cleared the air and brightened the future is so unspeakable a relief as quite to absorb all personal gratulation and humble me with thankfulness and hope. . . . It is evident that the tempers of men have been rendered more genial, rather than less, by the renewed discussion. It is all owing to the admirable conduct of the meeting, and especially to Thom's part in it, of which everyone speaks with boundless admiration. No wonder that I felt all along a reliance on the moral power of my friends which they could hardly feel for themselves. I knew, too, that Tayler, though he did not and need not join in my act, was really held to his position by the most precarious tie, — which an hour's despondency might at any time sever, and which nothing could secure but a public manifestation of confidence. Now, he is in bright spirits again, and we shall be able to go to our work with the energy of trust instead of the restraints of circumspection.

For, in spite of your wise cautions and criticisms, dear friend, you will never make me a "prudent" and "decorous"

teacher. If God's realities were *dangerous,* I should see room for courage in facing them or discretion in evading them; but as it is, there seems to me to be no scope for anything in the explorer and teacher but insight and simplicity. I do not in the least repent of that Vaughan sermon, or admit that, in bringing the Apostles under the universal law of God's inspiration, it says anything "*against*" them. The future of Christianity among thoughtful men depends entirely, I am profoundly convinced, on the substitution, for the notion of documentary or personal infallibility, of a doctrine of historical development of Divine truth, chiefly through the implicit and spontaneous reverences rather than the intentional teachings, of the human organs employed. It is curious that, just while this College cry of heresy is raised in England, the most conservative body of Unitarians in the world — the American Unitarian Association — are republishing with their *imprimatur* not only this particular sermon, but all the Westminster articles which have caused a hubbub among our sensitive parsons here. The plain truth is, the state of theological learning and thought in our body has fallen so low, that the very questions which occupy the rest of the cultivated world are inappreciable, even in their first statement and conditions, to the conductors of our press and most of the preachers in our pulpits. Men like . . . — who have never read or studied at all since they left College, thirty years ago, and who simply reproduce the budget they made up in the York class-rooms — may be and are most worthy exponents of the *then* state of things; but are surely not suitable arbitrators on controversies due to the changed position of theological science in the last quarter century, and almost wholly conducted in a language which they cannot read. I respect the dogmatism of a man like Andrews Norton, who kept himself well up to his date, and spoke with the credentials of critical knowledge. But I complain of the hot, impatient judgments of those whose displeasure proceeds not from insight but from helplessness. . . .

Affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

LIVERPOOL, April 24, 1857.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — From all quarters tidings come in of the good results produced by last week's discussion and vote, results attributed with singular unanimity to your powerful

and noble management of the case. I knew it would be so, — whatever the division of numbers; and you must forgive me if I felt an obstinate confidence in the moral impression which the meeting would leave, — a confidence which, as it mainly rested on you, you were not likely to appreciate fairly. A mean and bad cause had *put itself* in a false and vulnerable position; and had then *been put* into a position to become (as I thought) dangerous. The moment seemed eminently favourable for exhibiting its real character and testing its strength. Of the latter your estimate has certainly proved nearer the truth than my own. At the same time, the decisive step taken was just what brought home to so many of the protesters the consciousness of having made a mistake, and practically broke up the party; so that the weakness of the minority has not simply been *exhibited,* but in part *created,* by the holding of the meeting. At all events, it is evident that men's tempers have been sweetened, and their hopes brightened, and their zeal animated, by this termination of the crisis. Aspland (whom I have seen) is more kindly, and in the "Reformer" will be less distrustful and damaging. Mr. Kenrick writes quite cordially and hopefully. Tayler is quite a new man, and declares that he is delivered from a horrid nightmare that would have continued to weigh upon his mind. And numerous laymen who never before cared for the College or the religious interests for which it provides, quitted Manchester with an awakened sense of their duty in these relations. With the subsidence of these prefatory excitements and the approach of the working reality of the new duties, a thousand self-distrusts creep over me, and open another order of anxieties. But these are but the permanent burthen of a mind with more care of conscience than full joy of faith; and do not prevent my thankful acknowledgment that with all the outward and human conditions I am now in complete reconciliation. The former students in my classes have presented me with an address which cannot but encourage and rejoice the heart of a teacher, by showing that his function has not failed. . . .

Ever, dear Friend,
Affectionately yours,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

TO REV. J. J. TAYLER.

AUGUST 24, 1857.

Though I am half-frightened at your sketch of the Undergraduate wants, I have no doubt of its fidelity; and I dare say

the work will be less formidable in execution than it looks in description. But I fear you will find it to be my fault that I have not an offhand extempore nature; everything costs me pains; so that very simple matters, that flow out by light of nature from others, wait for preliminary labour with me. But you may depend upon my best endeavours, and in a year or two many things may become clear and light that as yet are anxious because untried.

Severe personal annoyance was not yet over. In June Mr. Tayler and Mr. Kenrick, to whom the preliminary selection of a teacher of Hebrew had been left, were prepared to nominate Mr. G. V. Smith, who was now known to be willing to accept the post; and a Committee meeting was summoned for the 17th. On the 16th the meeting was countermanded; and it became known that Mr. Martineau had interfered, and the nominators were therefore unprovided with a suggestion. In July Mr. Russell Martineau was appointed. It is easily understood that this train of events would look highly suspicious to men who regarded Mr. Martineau with no favourable eye; but it was strange, without full knowledge of the circumstances, to charge such a man with "discreditable conduct," and with violating the "principles of justice, honour, and fairness." There can be no doubt that the gentlemen who thought it their duty to do so acted in perfectly good faith; especially as their friend Mr. Smith, whose acquirements were not disputed, felt himself aggrieved, and thought that Mr. Martineau had needlessly injured him. It had, however, been forgotten that between January 30 and February 20 Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau, who had not yet accepted the invitation of the Committee, were engaged, by request, in preparing a joint scheme, which expressly included "due provision for instruction in Hebrew." In the fulfilment of this task they discussed various plans, rejecting those to which either of them felt an insuperable objection. One of these plans was the nomination of Mr.

Smith; and Mr. Martineau wrote in the most explicit terms to Mr. Tayler, that he was firmly resolved not to commit himself to this new enterprise, and incur the great sacrifices which it involved, "of old and endeared relations, of unbounded freedom and trust, and of more than a third of" his "income," if that plan were adopted. The reasons for this decision were afterwards spoken of as "political," by which it was obviously meant that, considering all the circumstances of the case, he did not think that the appointment would conduce to the interests of the College. His first feeling, however, was one of delicacy towards Mr. Smith himself. Writing to Mr. Tayler on February 2, he states that the absoluteness of Mr. Smith's resignation was a *sine qua non* of his acceptance of the new arrangement. "There is nothing invidious and painful," he says, "in the distribution between you and me of work set free by the retirement of our colleague. But what can be more odious than to take his work away from him whilst he remains, and to put him on the reduced list of mere Hebrew or Old Testament teacher? No consideration would induce me to enter such a position." Whether or not he was correct in his judgment he was clearly within his right in refusing to connect himself with an experiment which wounded his own feelings of respect for an esteemed colleague, and which he thought portended failure. His alleged interference consisted solely in reminding Mr. Tayler of these facts, which, in the anxiety of an unsettled time, his friend had for the moment forgotten. He had no personal reasons whatever for his action. He referred to Mr. Smith in the most kindly terms, and, while he was inflicting a temporary pain, he believed that for his old colleague, as well as for the College, he was taking the wisest step.

But what of the appointment of his own son? With this he had nothing whatever to do. On the contrary, he

more than once strongly recommended Mr. Sauerwein, a thorough Hebraist, trained by Ewald; but Ewald himself recommended Mr. Russell Martineau, and it was this great scholar's "spontaneous and unsolicited" mention of him that induced Mr. Tayler to send for him, and open the communications which terminated in his appointment. Mr. Martineau's only part in the transaction was his not interfering to preclude his son from a congenial office freely and honourably conferred upon him. A letter of Mr. Tayler's certifies that he never once exchanged a word with Mr. Martineau on the subject during the whole of the proceedings, and that the suggestion came entirely from himself, under a strong feeling both of the needs and of the proprieties of the case.

A letter having been printed and circulated among the Trustees, containing injurious charges against Mr. Martineau, he addressed a letter on the 21st of August to the Chairman of the Committee, requesting that a legitimate opportunity of vindication should be provided in some efficacious way. Accordingly, when the Committee met on the 16th of September, a resolution was passed that various documents, which were read, afforded a complete refutation of the injurious statements and insinuations. Mr. Tayler was by this time convinced that, though the withdrawal of Mr. Smith's name had been against his own feelings and wishes, the wisest course had been pursued.

In order to complete this long episode we must trespass for a moment on the London period. The resolution of the Committee did not allay the dissatisfaction out of doors; and as late as December 31 Mr. Martineau had to write to Mr. Thom: "At present, even friendly people believe in the main the statements made . . . , and letters come to me with assurances that no one who knows human nature and the world thinks of blaming a father who uses an opportunity of pushing the interests of his son, and

keeping a suitable place for him while he can. You will readily feel that this style of defence and support is infinitely more painful to me than Mr. ——'s attacks." He felt, therefore, that a full explanation ought to be given at the ensuing Annual Meeting of Trustees. The meeting was held in Manchester on the 21st of January. The last paragraph of the Committee's Report refers to the paper impugning the conduct of Professor Martineau, and states that "the Committee by a majority of votes came to the conclusion that the documents laid before them afforded a complete refutation of the charges against Mr. Martineau." It was assumed that the adoption of the Report, which, on the motion of Mr. William Shaen, was carried by a very large majority, pledged everyone who voted for it to agreement with the verdict of the Committee. A futile attempt was also made to rescind Mr. E. W. Field's resolutions of the previous April. This meeting was not satisfactory to Mr. Martineau. He thought that the mere adoption of the Report did not give a clear impression that the charges were erased by public vote. And he adds, in a letter to Mr. Thom: —

"The cold paragraph with which the Committee's Report concludes — violating all precedent in order to state my exoneration by *a Majority* while every other act is and always has been stated as the act of the *Committee* — does such a bare minimum of justice that it had far better have been omitted altogether. . . . But I know how tempting is the policy of sacrificing servants in order to conciliate opponents; and it was perhaps a weakness in me to expect more generous consideration. You at least, dear friend, and Mr. Shaen did what was possible to set things right; and I now turn my back to this dreadful year, and, with such hope as it has left me, abated though it be, lose its impression in the duties that lie before me." [1]

[1] The foregoing account is taken from reports in "The Christian Reformer," and a great pile of letters and documents.

We must now retrace our steps, and return to more peaceful, though in some respects hardly less trying scenes. On the 20th of February, 1857, he addressed the following letter to his Congregation: —

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, LIVERPOOL, Feb. 20, 1857.

DEAR FRIENDS,—When a few months ago I was induced to withdraw "for a season" my tendered resignation of the Ministry among you, I little thought how soon a call of clearer duty would oblige me to renew it and carry it to completion. But the term of twenty-five years seems not without reason to have haunted me with the sense that a change was due to you; for, ere it has expired, a Higher Will reinforces the impression from another side, and offers me elsewhere a trust which I dare not decline. On the retirement of one of the Professors of Manchester New College, London, the Principal and the remaining Professor have been requested to divide the Academical duties mainly between them; and after seriously seeking all attainable light for a faithful judgment, we have this day accepted the responsibility. I must therefore have the sorrow of resigning into your hands next Autumn the office I have so long held, and quitting the service and the scene endeared by a thousand ties.

Were this resolve the result of personal preference, it might well be condemned as ungrateful and imprudent; — ungrateful towards you, from whom I have received nothing but affection, generosity, and patience; imprudent for myself and my house, who can never expect to replace elsewhere the security and comfort — much less the lifelong attachments — which we shall leave behind. *Gain* does not tempt me, for I go to a poorer life; or *Ambition*, for I retire to a less conspicuous; or *Ease*, for I commit myself to unsparing labour. And of the unbounded freedom and confidence so nobly vouchsafed to me here, it is no secret to me that I must expect less, even though I should deserve it more. But none of these things move me from the feeling that the work proposed to me is, of all the offices of life, that which I can best fulfil; and that, in being humanly offered, it is also Providentially assigned. In the Church of Christ, each has to place his gifts and opportunities at disposal for the divine economy of the whole. And as faithful Ministers are, happily, more numerous than habitual Students, the scholastic thinker does a double wrong when he detains a pulpit from men of more effective spiritual

gifts, and declines the lecture-room which he can congenially serve.

If, to shun this wrong, I bear to part from those whom I have immediately taught, it is but to minister to them indirectly, and try to teach their teachers. At least, I may console myself with the fancy, that to serve the wants of *all* our societies cannot be to abandon the service of *any*. And should it be permitted me, under the guidance and with the sympathy of a revered friend and colleague, to spend the remaining years of active life in sustaining the succession of enlightened preachers of God's Word, I shall rejoice to have through them some communion with the future, and to render the most appropriate help of the retiring generation to the new.

I will not anticipate the pain of separation by dwelling on all that it involves. This only let me add. The step which I have taken would be doubly grievous to me, did I not believe that, however taxing to our mutual affection, it will be approved by your serious judgment and sustained by your powerful moral support. You will not make it a reproach to me, that I quit the shelter of your friendship in obedience to a more adventurous call. Remembering that, in times when men's spirits are much stirred, every considerable duty has difficulties disturbing to indolence and fear, you would not wish me dismayed by a few shadows on my path, or condemn the good hope that looks beyond them. You will lighten by your encouragement the burthen of the work to which I go, and will grant to it and its labourers that generous confidence and appreciation, without which the most energetic fidelity of service must remain unfruitful.

Under correction from future exigencies, or from your wish, I should propose that my ministerial term should expire at Michaelmas next. Should the annual recess you allow me immediately precede this date, the opportunity would perhaps be convenient for seeking my successor. My actual departure would thus take place at the end of July or the beginning of August.

Under all changes of time and place,
I am, and shall remain, dear friends,
Gratefully and affectionately yours,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

This letter was read at a special meeting of the Congregation on the following Sunday, February 22, when it was

moved by Mr. Avison, seconded by Mr. C. E. Rawlins, Jr., and unanimously resolved: —

"That the letter of Rev. James Martineau, this day read, be printed and circulated amongst the members of the Congregation, and that the same be referred to the Committee, with an instruction to prepare suitable resolutions to be presented to an adjourned Meeting of the Congregation to be held this day fortnight, immediately after morning service."

The adjourned meeting was held on Sunday, 8th March. Mr. Thomas Avison occupied the Chair. Mr. John Pemberton Heywood moved the first resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Thomas Bolton, and carried unanimously: —

"That this Congregation receive with deepest sorrow the intimation contained in Rev. James Martineau's letter to them, dated 20th February, 1857, of the approaching termination of the connection so long existing between him and them, in consequence of his having accepted an invitation to undertake additional academical duties in Manchester New College, London, on the retirement of one of the present professors."

Mr. Lamport then moved, Mr. Bulley seconded, and it was unanimously resolved: —

"That the following letter, signed by the Chairman on behalf of the Congregation, be presented to Mr. Martineau."

LIVERPOOL, 8th March, 1857.

DEAR MR. MARTINEAU, — We sorrowfully submit to the decision announced in your letter to us of the 20th of last month. Respect for you and for ourselves restrains us from efforts to detain you with us; — for you, because, did we make the attempt, we know it must be ineffectual in the face of your expression of conscientious resolve; for ourselves, because the sacrifices *you* are about to make to the higher duties which call you away, remind us of our obligation to be true to your teachings and example, by bearing without murmur the not lighter sacrifice which is demanded from *us*.

As you glance back, in your letter, at the past twenty-five years, it must be of your own kind feelings and not of our deserts that you can speak as you are pleased to do of the part

we have borne in the relations so long subsisting between us. Our own retrospect of the same period excites in us emotions bordering on self-reproach; for while its lights, as we look back on the past, are continually disclosing causes for gratitude to and affectionate remembrance of you, its shadows mercifully veil shortcomings and faults of our own.

We, too, are able to find relief in the thought that our present loss may prove indirectly the means of future gain to our successors. But we console ourselves, besides, with the expectation that the influences hitherto shed upon us from the Pulpit may in some measure be directly continued to us through the Press. And permit us to add an expression of our hope that, from the Pulpit still, no year may pass without our being allowed to hear again the voice whose tones we have listened to so long and loved so well.

We venture to congratulate you that your own practical solution of the previously difficult problem — how to reconcile the freest spirit of inquiry with the devoutest spirit of reverence — is fast becoming a powerful instrument in the hands of the Leaders of Thought generally in the present age. And we rejoice in the conviction that the views of Providence, of Duty, of Human Life, which year after year have been unfolded from the pulpit of our Church, are influencing Thought and Feeling, widely and more widely, far beyond the range of the Churches among which you more immediately labour.

Nor, believe us, do we fail to recognise the obligation you have laid upon ourselves. Exposed for a quarter of a century to the first and directest action of spiritual and moral agencies which we know to be stirring the world of Mind outside us, we humbly trust it may be given us to prove, by the answer of our future lives as Individuals and as a Church, that the Word sown in our hearts has in no wise been cast away.

That the Giver of all good may shed His choicest blessings on you and your House is the earnest prayer of your grateful and affectionate friends and fellow-worshippers.

The Congregation assembling for Divine Worship in Hope Street Church,

By Thomas Avison, *Chairman.*

On the 18th of March he received a farewell address from the "Hope Street Mutual Improvement Society." On the 26th of July the Congregation of Renshaw Street Chapel passed a resolution adopting an address which

expressed their grateful regard for him, and their confidence in his future work. With perhaps a tacit allusion to the controversies which had been raised about his connection with the College they say: —

"We have a further debt of gratitude not peculiar to ourselves indeed, but shared by our fellow-believers throughout the Country; — for, Sir, it is owing in no small degree to yourself, in conjunction with some few others, that the Unitarianism of the last Century has developed into a more spiritual and a higher faith, and that a deeper reverence for Christ and Christianity has grown up among us.

"We would now express our entire confidence in the training which in your new sphere you will give our future Ministers. You will inculcate the necessity of personal conviction and unswerving honesty in theology. You will teach how best to preserve what truths the past has given, how best to press forward to what the future may reveal. Under the direction of Mr. Tayler and yourself we do not fear but that our College will grow in usefulness, and that it will long preserve that line of truth-loving Ministers which is our best inheritance from our English Presbyterian Ancestry."

In addition to these more public expressions of regard and admiration he received several private letters, conveying in touching words the writers' sense of that deep spiritual gratitude which can find utterance only on rare occasions. Among these his friend Mr. Thom, who was absent from Liverpool, wrote a farewell letter. A few lines will indicate the strong affection by which the two men were bound to one another: —

"Any express parting with you would have been more painful to me than I can tell you. I trust that I am not growing less genial and confiding as I grow older, but to a man of fifty the friendship of five-and-twenty years, and the faith of long experience can never be replaced. . . . It is true that we were both too busy to see a great deal of one another, — but it was not necessary; — when men have entire confidence and a full understanding of one another, a little time goes a great way, and there was not a day in which you did not contribute to my

peace through the knowledge that I had one near me with whom I could take counsel in any difficulty that might arise, in the largest spirit and from the purest insight. In this respect I shall feel an anxiety in my position that I have never known before. It is no small ground for thankfulness to God and to you that in closing this relation there has never been, so far as I know, the feeling of a divided interest between us."

As disclosing one of the special influences of his ministry, a few sentences may be quoted without impropriety from a letter addressed to him by a constant hearer: —

"To your influence exclusively I owe my deep love for our blessed Saviour. This I feel to be the great advance which the modern phase of Unitarianism has made. I was brought up to be so much afraid of giving too much honour to Christ, lest it might derogate from the honour due to God alone, that I was afraid to let my natural feelings have their way; and this I am sure has been the case with many most loving hearts brought up under similar influences."

Amid these spiritual gifts the material were not forgotten. On the 28th of July the Church Committee appointed a small deputation to wait upon him on the following Wednesday. The result is related, among other matters, in a letter to Mr. Thom: —

LIVERPOOL, Aug. 5, 1857.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — Could you contrast the quiet of your retreat with the chaos of my half-broken-up camp, and the agitation of spirit brought by deeper causes, you would understand, as I know you forgive, my delay in acknowledging your charming words of adieu. Everything just now so fills me with best wishes and anxieties for our people here, that, although separation from you stands foremost among the privations of removal, your continuance here is my chief stay and comfort; and I would not, if I could, have you otherwise placed, though it should bring you within nearer reach. Not Liverpool alone, but this whole district, needs you as a soul to our congregations. Scarcely have they any without you, and you will not flag, as since your departure I have done, from a certain desolateness and want of sympathy. Mr. Channing, I am happy to say, has accepted his year at Hope Street.

No other arrangement could satisfy so many wants or so well occupy the period of transition, and though in general the successive occupation of two pulpits in the same town by the same minister is not advisable, his delightful dispositions will carry you all through the experiment without danger.

I have been overwhelmed with the profuse kindness of friends, and humbled by appreciations that show how much better men may feel than judge respecting one. To-day I have been startled by the presentation, through representatives of the Congregational Committee, of one of Rookell's best watches and a purse of seven hundred guineas. And from the Renshaw Street Congregation, an address, most cordial in relation to the past, and seasonable in its expression of confidence for the future, was sent last week. Of the trying hours of last Sunday morning I dare not speak. You know what such a struggle is. . . .

With kindest regards,
Affectionately yours,
JAMES MARTINEAU.

That the long connection might not be entirely severed, an arrangement was made that he should visit the congregation once a year.

His farewell sermon, called "Parting Words,"[1] was preached on the 2d of August. The text was from 1 Corinthians iii. 7: "Neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase." The sermon is marked by the finest characteristics of the preacher, and more than most is a revelation of his inmost life. He undertakes to "tell the trust which has possessed" him from the beginning. The beautiful exposition should be read in full; but a few short extracts may convey the kernel of the thought: —

"The one deep faith, then, which has determined my whole word and work among you, is in *The Living Union of God with our Humanity*. . . . We pine as prisoners, till we burst into the air of that *supernatural life which He lives eternally;* we are parched with a holy thirst, till we find contact with the

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

running waters of his quick affection. Him *immediately;* Him *in person;* Him in whispers of the day, and eye to eye by night; Him for a close refuge in temptation, not as a large thought of ours, but as an Almightiness in himself; Him ready with his moistening dews for the dry heart, and his breathings of hope for the sorrowing; Him always and everywhere living for our holy trust, do we absolutely need for our repose, and wildly wander till we find. . . . Through all our natural life, individual and social, is the supernatural interfused; and the ideal colours of heaven are spread through the substance of our experience, to transfigure it. In us, however, there is ever a strife between the two. *In Christ alone* is the reconciliation perfect between the human and the divine; and of the blended natures, the lower yields as a captive, and is, in him, wholly taken up by the higher. This once was God's idea purely realised. But the same two natures meet in us all; and he is but the exemplar of a perpetual incarnation, — of a living and constant union of God with our humanity."

The following paragraph reveals the deep religious ground of some of his "negations," and the reverent delicacy which often closed his lips or allowed him to speak only a few suggestive words even to those whose hearts thirsted for more: —

"Moved by the same persuasion, — of God's living union with our humanity, — I was early led, not only into abhorrence of the priestly character, but into an estimate perhaps too low of all disciplinarian methods for the administration of Churches, for the propagation of personal influence, and the voluntary management of Christian men. Unless it were possible to go right down to the seats of inmost faith, and waken the conditions of God's spirit there, a certain shame has ever haunted me at resorting to subsidiary agencies, in the wielding of which I could find no support from inward conviction. Without appeal to deep affections, no real thing seems to be done; and with it, the fruit would secretly ripen by night and day. 'Water the roots, then, and let them grow.' Such has been my thought, — perhaps also my infirmity. I am far from recommending it to others, though alone possible to me. If I have erred in this, it has been from too much trust in others, too little in myself, from belief in the spirit alive in their hearts, and misgivings of its force in my own. How it is, I know not;

but in private — to this one and to that — I could never talk of what is holiest without an advance of sympathy that makes the talk all needless. Is it perhaps a sign of our organic union as social men, that true reverence can never speak above a whisper, unless it be *to multitudes;* — but *then* can breathe its full tones, be they sorrowful or jubilant, and never doubt that they go home? O brothers all! What are we but of stammering lips and dumb, when taken one by one; but, in communion, a chorus of solemn voices answering to the simplest sign, now mellowed to the music of humanity, now appealing to the glory of the Most High?"

His closing words pointed to an ideal in which his own personal service might be lost and forgotten: —

"And now, dear Friends, the last words must come. It is human to wish not to be forgotten. Yet, believe me, to be lost from your memory and die away by the dawn of what is higher is my inmost desire. Could I fear indeed that hereafter heedless change and fading reverence might betray you into lower mood; that instead of taking up the beauty of this place and the affluence of your opportunities as the simple organ of expression for your own piety, you might degrade them into a mechanism for 'attraction,' the rhetoric of a sect canvassing the world; that not real inner worship for yourselves, but side persuasion for others, might here give the tone to the hours, — then it would indeed be bitter to be *thus* forgot. But for the rest, the sooner and further a greater and holier spirit snatches you away, and leaves these years enshadowed and traceless in the past, the intenser will be my joy that my work has reached its end, that I am poured out and lost on the offering of your faith, and that the sacrifice is accepted and complete. And so may the Lord perfect in you his Grace and Glory!"

LETTERS, 1849–1857

TO THE REV. W. R. ALGER.

PARK NOOK, LIVERPOOL, April 5, 1853.

Your view of Paul's belief as to the effect of Sin I must carefully examine. It may very likely throw new light on many passages still obscure; but it would be presumptuous to pronounce upon it without renewed and special research. I

have hitherto thought it impossible to escape the conclusion that Paul did regard mortality as the consequence of sin; and even held it as axiom founded in the inherent necessity of things, that *sinlessness and deathlessness* were inseparable and *vice versa;* so that what the sin of Adam did, the holiness of Christ undid, and restored the original paradisaical immortality. Nor does the distinction between the natural and the spiritual man appear to me to contradict this; for this very distinction — not less than its consequence of death — was perhaps regarded by him as the consequence and expression of Sin. Had the first parents not forfeited paradise, they would have still been within reach of the fruit of the tree of life. The underworld, which Christ was finally to close, and which the living Christians at his coming were not to enter, would never have been opened at all, had mankind remained in Paradise. *All* would then from the first have escaped death in the same way with the living disciples at the Advent; except that these, retaining the psychical elements of their unconverted state, had to undergo a change and sudden investiture with immortality; while *unfallen* men would have remained *pneumatic* and never become *psychical.* I incline also to think that the locality to which Paul referred the scene after the Advent was not *heaven,* but *this earth.* Even 1 Thess. iv., which is the chief difficulty in the way of this view, seems to me to be really founded on it. But these are minor matters, which, on the suggestion of your admirable paper, I reserve for reconsideration. You mistake me greatly, I fear, in ascribing to me any special fitness for recovering the image of this great apostle. I have long become so dissatisfied with the materials which I had partially thrown into shape respecting him, and feel so much the want of leisure and learning for the completion of the once projected work, that it is doubtful whether I ever venture to proceed with my task. Of late years my attention has been devoted much more to philosophy — which it is my office to teach — than to theology, of which, scanty as my store of it is, I know too much for my peace, in a country and a sect enslaved to the letter of Scripture and tradition.

Should your Unitarian world split in twain, it is possible that ours may follow the example, which would certainly intensify our tendency to division. Should no such impulse from without affect us, we shall probably hold together and gradually take up the new elements and living spirit of the present; or else dwindle away into merited dissolution. The

antagonism between the conflicting elements is less strong than with you; and the conservative feeling of an old country makes new movements — like Theodore Parker's — impossible, except in some recognised channel. Even great personal qualities, like Parker's, when exercised from an isolated position, collect *here* only the unsteady, the querulous, and the unreligious, and can *create no church.* So with the keenest sense of the very evils of which you also complain, those of us who sigh for connexion with a nobler life, and "in this" Unitarian "tabernacle do groan being burthened," are nevertheless content to abide in it, so long as our personal freedom of speech and conscience is not interfered with, and our congregations are faithful. Yet, after all, it seems an easier task to make other churches liberal and free than to make our own devout and high-souled; and such works as the "Prospective Review" have more influence everywhere than among our Ebionitish people.

LIVERPOOL, Jan. 16, 1854.

It seemed, till within the last ten days, as though the long diversion of my studies into the channel of philosophy were about to cease by the removal of our College to London; and I was beginning to think of theology again. But a sudden renewal of my relation to the College, carrying me to London for three days' lecturing in each fortnight, puts an end to this dream for the present, and demands all my spare time for the work of my Professorship. In the sensitive condition of our Churches here perhaps it is well that it should be so. On subjects of Morals and Metaphysics a hearing can be obtained more serious and candid than when I touch on questions of historic and scriptural criticism; and though I have equally strong convictions in both cases, I am conscious of a more careful grounding in philosophy than in Biblical divinity. Still, if no one meanwhile speaks what seems to me to need expression, and if a little leisure should yet be allowed me after satisfying this prior claim, I do not despair of returning in the autumn of life to the project thrown out in its spring time.

. . . . . .

Few things are more welcome than to meet with a little sympathy among men of a School of thought nominally foreign to one's own; and your report of my orthodox reader in the scene of your late excursion is consolatory to one who is accustomed to the repute of "an infidel" at home. I be-

lieve that anyone who simply seeks the realities of God will find himself below the differences of faith, and speak a language foreign, it may be, to theologic schools, but vernacular to natural love.

TO R. H. HUTTON, ESQ.

LIVERPOOL, Nov. 10, 1849.

I quite understand, my dear Richard, your mortification at being called too profound in your preaching. You will be happy if the charge does not follow you, as it does me, through life, and repeat itself week by week, till your heart is ready to sink in despair. The passion for what is called *plainness* seems very strange in people whose religion lies in the gospel of John and the epistles of Paul. I believe we must bear up against this reproach, and speak faithfully what is given us to say, without much regard to that standard of usage which regulates "intelligibilites."

With love from us all,

Ever affectionately yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

LIVERPOOL, June 8, 1850.

Your letter comes as if in immediate answer to many thoughts about you which have been visiting me for some time; and it opens to me hopes of something better than the distant imaginations of intercourse, which, after all, are but dialogues of the dead. . . . Let us then hope that you will come to us about the 24th July, and either directly or indirectly (as you may prefer) supply Hope Street for three Sundays at least; and we will consecrate our week-days to Plato, Kant and Hegel, as in old times. We can find walks that will vie with the Thiergarten even in this desolate country; and if the sight of the distant mountains sets you panting for a freer air, we will go off, with Russell, for a few days' ramble among the hills. In order fairly to try the experiment, whether it is possible to vindicate one's holiday without going from home, I mean to practise a legal fiction and consider myself in the "County Wicklow"; being inaccessible to tax-gatherers, and hardened against Committee Meetings, and perhaps even frequenting on the Sundays obscure and extraordinary churches. Should dinner invitations come, it may be necessary to send over to be answered from the Irish Coast. So you must expect no gaiety and consider yourself as little better than a

prisoner on parole. But if you do not mind the seclusion (which, after all, will not perhaps be very complete), come and share it with us. Should desirable proposals present themselves for any of the Sundays otherwise engaged here, we could no doubt devise some modified arrangement at the time.

. . . . . .

I hear nothing of the Owens College, from which any reasonable conjectures can be formed; but my impression is that Mr. Scott will be appointed. The time, I fear, has not arrived when people of our class can get a hearing, — except, like Plato's philosopher, from a knot of youths in a corner; and except so far as our own institutions provide for us opportunities denied elsewhere we shall die and give no sign. Your account of J. H. Newman interests me deeply; and I am burning to hear him. As I do not expect to be in Birmingham before the 15th or 18th July, I fear his lectures will be over. Of the "Phases of Faith," my present impressions (limited to the first two-thirds of the volume) are undefined and superficial, as I have read the book only in a railway carriage. As an expression of the truthfulness and simplicity of the author's own mind the book has an unspeakable charm. In its train of thought there seems nothing that can be new to even the slighter students of modern theology; and so far as the *external* authority of the Scriptures, their *oracular* character, is concerned the line of argument has long appeared to me conclusive and fatal. But the narrowness with which he limits himself to this one view strikes me as something quite curious in a man of such warm affections and clearness of moral sense. He never seems to have looked at all — either in his early days or now — into the *personality* of Christ; but to have regarded the Gospels as mere depositories and guarantees of the Messianic facts necessary as conditions of the Pauline theory; and when they appeared to give way in this character, they broke before him into nothing; and there was even hindrance in the way of his contracting a manifest *dislike* of *Christ*. The original picture having faded away, he does not appear to me to have possessed the power of substituting another; and at this moment I can find no trace of his having formed any conception of what the mind and life of Jesus really were, and what was the central idea that inspired them, or scheme that characterised them. The same want of largeness of view appears, I think, in his estimate of Christianity in history. A slight infusion into his mind of his brother's doctrine of *development* — of a Providential concord between certain religious data

and the conditions of human character and history on which they were to fall—would render his judgments of this class—if I am not deceived — much more trustworthy. On the whole, I incline to believe that for the discernment of objective moral and spiritual beauty something more is necessary than a deep subjective sense of the Right and Holy; and that many who personally *feel* them are slow to *see* them in another; perhaps because they are felt in the detail of particular obligations and acts, but can be seen only in the unity of an entire character and living soul. Whatever be the cause, this power of spiritual representation Mr. Newman seems to me not to possess. Hence I do not think he is given to feel *admiration,* unless to some living person with whom he has intercourse; and between his own individual mind and the Infinite no mediating object of reverence can be qualified to stand. Hence when Christianity lost its place with him as a religion of *gratitude* (for *salvation*) and then as a religion of *assurance* there was no niche which it could yet hold as a religion of *veneration.* I am far from being sure that this characteristic is not rather a perfection of mind and that the clinging to images of extreme admiration may not be a weakness. If so, it is a weakness in which, for my own part, I find it indispensable to live; and without which, however secure against possible delusion, I should fancy myself doomed to certain blindness. I may perhaps have to review this book for the "Prospective"; but I want Mr. Tayler to do it.

LIVERPOOL, Jan. 16, 1851.

Late as it is to send New Year's wishes you will not despise them, or think them less hearty because they are not punctual to their date. I do trust indeed that this will be a brighter and happier year to you than any past one; and that in various ways the anxieties and doubts of a transition period will be clearing themselves away. I cannot but think that you will find a permanent settlement in Manchester, though it is difficult at present to be confident of the *quomodo.* In all speculations on the probable turn of public affairs, and their bearing on Ecclesiastical and Educational matters, I always have your image before me, and fancy the opening of some glorious sphere just adapted to make the most of you; and you cannot imagine how many costumes I have tried on you, to see how they would fit. There are some schemes floating in my mind which I should much like to talk over with you, but which, I am afraid, are too daring to be written about. Could you not

spend a few days with us on your way to Manchester, — including a Sunday, and then accompany me on the following Wednesday to Manchester? Sunday next (19th inst.) I have to give an evening lecture, and your help in the morning would be very welcome; and the Sunday following it would be still more so, because it might be doubled and come most lawfully to an unfortunate mortal who is almost spent with scribbling and drunk with ink, and tempted in his rage to rebel against the alphabetical characters altogether, — to curse Cadmus and die. Do contrive this. I know that when you are once settled at Manchester we shall not be able to get hold of you, and the only hope is to catch you on the way. Mrs. M. has been urging me not to let this opportunity slip, and all the young people will be delighted, — to say nothing of Leyson Lewis, who is with us at present.

Liverpool, May 19, 1852.

Whewell's book lies on my table; but I have hardly looked into it yet, except to see that he introduces one to some new acquaintances, and retains most of his old formulas. In spite of the "Athenæum's" praise, I rather dread the task of reading the book; for I find him a wearisome writer, giving one neither genial help nor brave contradiction. His thought never looks at you and meets your eye; and to commune with him is as uncomfortable as to converse with a squinting person. I was in hopes that you would review him for the "Prospective"; but Mr. Tayler tells me we must not urge it at present. I felt quite ashamed to ask you to correct the last pages of my Oersted paper for me, and most heartily obliged by your ready acceptance of the commission. I had written under great pressure of anxiety and difficulty and could not avoid being run to the last; and as the conclusion had reference to the translation, the correction of the press was important. Carlyle's "Pantheism" is not like that of Oersted or any philosopher, and is, I fear, an unmanageable object of attack. It is so wholly unsystematic, illogical, wild, and fantastic, that thought finds nothing in it to grapple with. How can one refute the utterances of an oracle or the spleen of a satirist? His power over intellectual men appears to me not unlike that of Joe Smith the prophet over the Mormons; dependent on strength of will and massive effrontery of dogma persevered in amid a universal incertitude weakening other men. The sick and anxious always like best the physician who has most assurance; they are comforted by the presence of so much

force, — just as poor prostrate France will believe in rifles and eagles after ceasing to believe in anything else. Carlyle's influence appears to spring much less from what he says, estimated by its own persuasiveness, than from the mere consideration that such a man as he thinks all moral and religious doctrine just so much unbelievable trash. I know not how such an influence can be met, except by a positiveness as powerful and as gifted. By the way, have you seen the Cambridge "Restoration of Belief," and can you conjecture the author? I half fancy it may be Isaac Taylor; though I do not know his later writings, and have an imperfect remembrance of his style. The pretension of the book, thus far, greatly outstrips the performance. It is indeed powerfully written and indicates much accomplishment in the author. But its strength is in *expression* and *statement,* not in argument, or correct apprehension of principles; and there is a certain *fussy,* eager laying out of the subject, which seems to show more desire to attain the end than clear power to do so. Nevertheless the tract is highly interesting and has some passages of rich and acute remark. I should much like to find out the author. Another book of the same kind, — "The Eclipse of Faith," I dare say you have seen, — designed chiefly as an answer to Newman and Parker with occasional reference to Greg. It takes up the position that there is no tenable middle-point between absolute Atheism and unqualified reception of the whole Bible (with the scheme of orthodox doctrines) as the word of God. It clearly exposes the difference of religious philosophy found among the so-called "Spiritualists." But no real justice is done to the opinions it would refute; and the temper of the book is caustic and ungenerous. In reading these things, I am ashamed of the effect they have upon my weakness; not on my convictions, — for I see where they logically fail, — but on my mere human feelings; — it is so painful to be exiled from the sympathies of faith, and observe the horror and scorn with which others regard what is religion to us. I long so profoundly to believe as others do, and feel so keenly their expressions of alienation and contempt, that the only fault I find with these attacks is that they are inadequate to convince me. While my own faith seems to become clearer every year, and to bear the test of repeated experiment upon new questions, so that I can trust myself to it more quietly than ever, I yet am unaccountably disturbed by the reproaches of confident critics and inclined to distrust myself rather than to repel them. It is perhaps one of the advantages of a faith resting merely on

a supposed external authority — like the Bible, as used by the orthodox — that its possessors can be unboundedly dogmatic without conscious self-conceit, even with an intenser piety; while those who feel the contingency of their faith upon subjective conditions, as well as on objective revelation, accuse themselves of personal immodesty in holding pertinaciously their own ground.

SKELWITH BRIDGE, NEAR AMBLESIDE, July 24, 1854.

Many of your "Inquirer" papers and notices are truly delightful to me; not least so your notice of the "Theologia Germanica," — noble gem of a book as it is deep and divine almost beyond Scripture itself. As to Mr. Thom's tender and beautiful Sermon,[1] I confess to a sympathy with it *too* profound to consist with an unhesitating approval of its confessions. True to the core, it tells what I think should remain a hidden cross, screened from sympathy, and not asking to be understood. An inner struggle that is inevitable, — the very condition of spiritual life and productiveness — the birth-throes of humanity in its regeneration, — why should such a thing be spoken of? Experiences no doubt are different. But for myself, I do not think that the evil arises at all considerably from the *frequency* of preaching. *Waiting to be moved* does not really and honestly answer; and with thought and spirit ever so ready, I still find the shadow of the task as deep and dark. The difficulty is ever great of accommodating the *spirit* to the *mechanism* of life, and to erect into *professions* any of the higher expressions of the soul — *Poetry, Art, Religion* — must always seem to contradict their freedom, and press severely on their inspiration. Yet, in fact, is not *Necessity* their condition as surely as God's spirit is their source; and is not *Pain* the appointed path of their realisation, — the Via Dolorosa of whatever saving help they bring? The tendency of this suffering to drive us to the refuge of *routine* is undeniable; but routine soon benumbs the suffering and kills the inspiration; and he who can describe the one and be the prophet of the other, as our dear friend can, bears involuntary witness that he, of all men, is free of the danger from

[1] This refers to "A Farewell Sermon," preached in Renshaw Street Chapel on the 25th of June. Mr. Thom retired for a time from the ministry because he felt oppressed by the incessant demand for the *expression* of religious thoughts and feelings; and in the sermon he laid bare his inmost sentiments upon this subject. — J. D.

which he flies. I feel therefore great sympathy with the laity who say that his reasons are refuted by the very force and spirit with which he states them, and who ask why suspend the conditions which at least have sufficed to mature so ripe a power? But how difficult it is to keep the boundary clear which separates the healthful from the morbid action of the religious life!

LIVERPOOL, April 11, 1855.

Your sensitiveness to Mr. ——'s complaints is highly amusing to me; almost as much so as his own droll demand for something "free and positive," with the evident reservation that the "freedom" be not taken with *his* prepossessions, and the "positive" be the construction of no other religion than his own. What is the use of trying to *conciliate* this sort of criticism, and by so-called "tact" to mediate between real contradictions? "Tact" has reference only to practical and personal affairs, and consists essentially in delicate consideration for every shade of feeling which may co-exist in the pursuit of a common end. But in matters of objective truth it has no place; and precisely what is respectable in any man's intellect surely is, that he sees his faith in its full difference from other men's, as well as in its elements of agreement. Your articles have always been remarkable for their respectful personal appreciation of all really worthy men and writers from whom you differ; and beyond this it would be unfaithful to go. For my own part, I would have nothing to do with the "Review," were not its religious philosophy clearly and definitely and earnestly at variance with the type of belief for which Mr. —— speaks. I dread all aim at *comprehensiveness* that may imply indistinct thought and feeble eclecticism. In these vacillating days it is a blessing to men to be helped to a conviction by the force and decision of minds that really have a faith; and we mistake our mission, I think, if we write circumspectly and dream of any other concessions than those of gentle and genial human feeling.

BORROWDALE, NEAR KESWICK, July 15, 1856.

The attempt to single out and disengage the *Christian* element in history, with the assumptions that in so doing you (1) separate the Divine from the Human and (2) must resort to the Gospels as your clue, seems to me to be a piece of false analysis, necessarily yielding a thin and meagre result. If God were in all the prior preparations of the world, especially in the aspirations of the Socratic and Platonic philosophy and

the moral thirst of which men became conscious in the feverish decline of Paganism, — surely the powerful working of these elements within the early Christianity is no less Divine than the reaction of the evangelical facts on them; and the theology of Christendom, with all its deep questions respecting God and Humanity, is to be regarded, notwithstanding its Hellenic and Oriental factors, as an integral system forming stages of development in the realisation of Divine truth. I cannot express myself as I wish; but perhaps you will translate me into some intelligible sense.

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

PARK NOOK, PRINCE'S PARK, April 26, 1851.

DEAR FRIEND, — You have indeed left me a charming legacy of remembrance, through which I shall commune with you in your absence. Scanty as our intercourse must be in this busy life, it is delightful to me to be in every possible way associated with you; and especially to be held worthy to join you in your tribute of reverence to the noblest of apostles and the most living monument from the literature of Christian antiquity.[1] To serve truth and sanctity *with* you and *under* Paul is a lot which the most favoured men might well consider blessed. The book looks *most* attractive; and I do not think I see it only through the loving light of dedication.

TO MISS CATHERINE WINKWORTH.

PARK NOOK, LIVERPOOL, Oct. 6, 1855.

MY DEAR MISS CATHERINE, — Let me confess to you a sin of greediness which I should hardly have brought home to myself but for the aid of your precious gift. I had hung back from ordering your volume,[2] though it excited my eager longing, in the secret hope that perhaps it might spontaneously appear. Yet it was not any stinginess, — as you will believe, — but a certain particular delight in being not forgotten by pupils and friends dear to my own memory that made me repress my impatience for a few days. And now you have rewarded my presumption, and rendered the book doubly sacred

[1] Referring to Mr. Thom's "St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians: an Attempt to convey their Spirit and Significance." The dedication to Mr. Martineau bears the date "April 14th, 1851.

[2] The "Lyra Germanica."

by your friendly and gracious words. Many delightful hours have I spent with the originals of these hymns; and it is easy to see at once that your translation introduces them to the English reader with the least possible drawback from passing out of their own language. The difficulty of really naturalising them among us arises, I think, less from the mere interposition of a foreign medium of expression than from a fundamental difference of national feeling in regard to religion; the extreme *inwardness* of the German Christian sentiment appearing to the English a little sickly and unreal; and the more descriptive or historical hymns of our own country seeming to Germans often painfully anthropomorphic, and usually deficient in close personal appropriation of the life and death of the Redeemer. A better service cannot be rendered than such a mediation between the two as your volume tends to effect.

TO MISS SUSANNA WINKWORTH.

LIVERPOOL, Dec. 7, 1852.

MY DEAR MISS WINKWORTH, — I know not how to thank you sufficiently for your remembrance of me on the appearance of your second edition.[1] The moment I saw the advertisement, I took measures for satisfying my curiosity; but before they could have effect, your splendid announcement came; and I feel quite elated with my unexpected wealth. Heartily do I congratulate you on the completion of your task, and your well-earned leisure for a little *irresponsible* reading and reflection. I fear that the recent bereavement sustained by our poor friend Dr. Pertz will have detained out of your hands any materials comprised in his last volume of "Stein." I am very curious to see the defence of Niebuhr's political conduct from the criticism of Mr. Newman and the Westminster Reviewer. The fault appears to me to have been real; but more in his temperament than in his will.

The pressure of other work has prevented me from passing at present beyond the first volume of the "Hippolytus." The critical part of Bunsen's case appears to me in the main established; and in the free, truth-loving spirit of the book there is an unspeakable charm. Whether his judgment against Baur and Schwegler as to Gospel of John is really sound, I feel some doubt; and he seems slightly touched by the prevalent

[1] "The Life and Letters of B. G. Niebuhr," edited and translated by Susanna Winkworth.

disposition to run down what is called the " Tübingen school," notwithstanding a generous testimony to the merits of Baur's " christliche Gnosis."

Your few expressive words about Bunsen's religious scheme of thought will send me to his second volume with double interest. It would indeed be a true joy to me to find again the fruits of my own striving thought as the results also of his infinitely richer knowledge and larger view. Hitherto I have always found, in the German religious philosophy, an excess of the Hellenic over the Hebrew element, — a phenomenon precisely reversed in England, and above all among the Unitarians. And if, as you suppose, there would be a limit to the concurrence I could feel with Bunsen, this, it is probable, is the source from which the divergency would proceed.

LIVERPOOL, March 19, 1856.

I have Kuno Fischer's two volumes, and have carefully read the earlier of them (the " Spinoza ") and partially the second. They appear to me to deserve a great deal of the praise bestowed upon them by Chev. Bunsen. Considered simply as expositions of given philosophical systems, they have the high merit of appreciating each system from the interior, and presenting its configuration as shaped out from its essential spirit, instead of describing it chiefly in its exterior aspect. His account of " Spinoza " is the most successful and complete I have ever met with. But were I asked from what point of view Fischer himself, after completing his several historical expositions, contemplates and compares the results, I should certainly say from one altogether Pantheistic, and other than Christian. I need not say that this does not, in my opinion, disqualify him in any way for the work he undertakes as an historian and teacher of philosophy; or that I think the persecution he has undergone anything but disgraceful to the authorities that removed him. . . . Bacon is a great subject. England is under a false and unintelligent idolatry of his name. To shake this would be a good work. But it is of the utmost consequence that the antagonism should come from the right side, — from an English direction, moral and religious, — and not from the Modern German philosophy, which will never get any real hold of the English mind. The matter is of more delicacy just now, because Spedding's " Life and Works of Bacon " are on the eve of publication, and will occasion a strong resistance to any *foreign* attempts to destroy the national idol.

TO MISS SUSANNA WINKWORTH

LIVERPOOL, May 21, 1856.

I wish Bunsen would tell you what he wants to say, and let you say it in your own lucid and forcible way.[1] The diffuse flood of his speech does not suit our English love of energy, directness, and concentration; and his spirit, always noble and often in seasonable relation to our wants, would have more power by transfusion through the mind of such interpreters as he might find in you. With his knowledge of our affairs, if he could only write like Karl Schwarz (whose capital little book, "Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie," you have doubtless seen) he might obtain a weighty influence over our ecclesiastical development.

. . . . . .

You ask about *Valdesso*. He was a Spanish gentleman contemporary with Luther and in sympathy with the reformatory movement. Removing to Naples, he wrote, in 1550, a book of Practical Piety, entitled "One Hundred Considerations"; from an Italian version of which an English Translation, approved and recommended by George Herbert, was made by Nicholas Farrer in 1638. The book is now rare. My young friend Henry A. Bright has picked up a copy, which he has lent to me, and which I asked and obtained his permission to send to you by any safe hand. *His* interest in the book arises mainly from the reputed "Unitarianism" of the author; and he is anxious to make out that "we too" have our mystical theologians. I have not yet read the book through. But thus far I find nothing of the depth and tenderness of either "Tauler" or the "Theologia Germanica"; and much more that is dogmatically objectionable, — *e. g.*, the doctrine of satisfaction, in applications almost antinomian. The book, however, is interesting and curious, and marked by the exaltation of the "Spirit" above the "Word," which is a distinctive feature of the Mystics. I will send it you by the first opportunity.

PARK NOOK, LIVERPOOL, Dec. 26, 1856.

Many things have contributed to fulfil your friendly wishes for the happiness of this Christmas time; but nothing in a greater degree than the surprise of your delightful gift of

---

[1] This presumably refers to Bunsen's "Signs of the Times: Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt on the danger to religious liberty in the present state of the world: translated by Susanna Winkworth, 1856." The preface is dated February 29. — J. D.

"Tauler." I unpacked it with reverent hand last evening; and when the excitement of the day was over, and the young folks had gone upstairs with their burthen of gifts and thankfulness, indulged myself with the first draught of its pure wisdom. I see at once that the book will be, for the rest of my life, one of my sacred guides; and will stand, after my Bible, with Plato, and Leighton, and the "Theologia Germanica," and Coleridge, and Tennyson, and the German and Wesley Hymns. A strange jumble, you will say, of heterogeneous springs of thought! — yet all, I think, assuaging to the same thirst. I do thankfully congratulate you on the completion of such a work, and on having clear hours at Christmas to rejoice in the blessing you have brought to many a reader.

TO THE REV. A. W. WORTHINGTON.

LIVERPOOL, Oct. 15, 1853.

The very question on which your thoughts have been engaged interests me just now a good deal in connexion with Mr. Newman's new Chapter in the "Phases of Faith" and Mr. Gordon's notice of it in the "Reformer." They both of them lay down and defend the principle, that Moral Perfection is an impossible predicate of human nature, and is conceivable only under supernatural conditions. Mr. Newman, regarding Christ as a mere man, pronounces him imperfect. Mr. Gordon, conceiving his Moral Perfection unimpeachable, is confirmed by it in the belief of his supernatural protection from all possible sin. To me the consequences of this principle appear to be precisely what you so clearly state. If all that is transcendent in Christ's sinless character is due to an exceptional provision in his favour, it can impose no obligation because it represents no possibility for us. It is not an exhibition of human but of superhuman excellence, and may be beautiful in our eyes, like the image of an angel-nature, but not binding to our conscience. Nor is it properly *moral* excellence at all, but rather constitutional symmetry and grace of soul, as little imitable by us as a clear complexion or a fine form. The doctrine appears to me eminently unscriptural also. The fact that he "was without sin" would have lost all its wonder, in the eyes of the early disciples, but for its connexion with the antecedent, that "he was tempted in all points as we are," which would no longer be true on Mr.

Newman's principle. And again his *exaltation* is uniformly treated by the apostles — especially Paul — as the *reward* of his obedience. But what a mockery to represent God as first taking care (by supernatural outfit or protection) that he should not sin, and then rewarding him for his immaculateness! I confess myself, moreover, quite unable to discover any tendency, in a hyperphysical nature or miraculous powers, to produce moral perfection. Such advantages would alter, for their possessor, the problem of duty, — surround him with new conditions, — lift him to a higher level of responsibility; but would leave it just as possible to abuse this larger trust as for us to abuse our smaller. We deceive ourselves by talking of *human* frailty as if it were an attribute of our race exclusively, and would be escaped by going out into higher natures. Surely *liability to sin* must attach to all beings capable of a moral life, and invested with a holy trust at all; and a bad angel must be just as possible as a wicked man. The possibilities of unfaithfulness can never be shut out so long as you remain in that realm of Free-will, beyond which faithfulness and unfaithfulness alike disappear. Either Christ's preternatural gifts rendered his obligations proportionally larger and more intense; and then they were no *moral* gain, for force and difficulty were increased together. Or else he was allowed, with superhuman powers, to restrict his aims to the human problem; and then *his* work was set on easier conditions than *ours*. The only way to preserve the application of Christ's Ideal to our Actual — so, at least, it has always seemed to me — is to identify the moral conditions of his life and ours, and to consider his inspiration as an enlargement instead of a relief to his trust, conceded to his prior and pre-eminent fidelity. In this light it becomes, not an exceptional and anomalous phenomenon, but only a conspicuous sample of the universal Law of God's communion with the human soul, — viz., that whoever uses a little grace well shall be endowed with more; and if he be true again to this greater, his spiritual light shall still increase; and so on without end. I see no sufficient reason for supposing that there was any particular *date* to which his inspiration should be assigned as a new event, though doubtless his inner life was not without its *crises*. Rather do I think of it as an ever-growing quantity, blending more and more of the Divine with the Human in him as his history deepened. Christ is thus the concrete exhibition of what God means by human nature; of His sympathy with its fidelity; of His destination of it to immortality.

And the miraculous element in the gospel history does not, in this view, disqualify Jesus for representing the general Law of our spiritual life and lot; but may be regarded merely as the means of giving conspicuousness and visibility of scale to an exemplary phenomenon not otherwise easily detected as Unique.

Chapter VII

PROFESSORSHIP IN LONDON, 1857–1869

On his removal to London, Mr. Martineau took a house in Gordon Street, not far from the scene of his labours in University Hall.[1] The aspect of the house must have looked dreary enough after the comparatively rural situation of Park Nook. A small back parlour, with no more delightful prospect than brick walls, was selected for the study. But if the exterior of the apartment was unattractive, the interior was adorned with handsome mahogany book-cases, filled with richly bound volumes; for its occupant was not indifferent to the appearance of his tools, and was always scrupulously neat and orderly in his work. He wrote on a small pedestal table which was well provided with drawers, and had not only a desk on which to write, but one which could be elevated by a rack, so that, when he wished to change his posture, he could read standing. The mornings in which he was not engaged at College were carefully guarded from intrusion, and visitors were not admitted without inquiries whether it was convenient for him to receive them. If, however, he was able to see them, nothing could be more gracious and kindly than his reception of them. The drawing-rooms, as is usual in old London houses, were upstairs; and here, on stated evenings, friends assembled, and any

[1] The number of the house at this time was 10. It was afterwards changed to 5; so that the altered number in the headings of his letters does not indicate a change of residence.

students who presented themselves were sure of a welcome, and of some pleasant mingling in cultivated society.

For nearly twelve years from this time Mr. Martineau was thrown into intimate association with the Rev. J. J. Tayler, the Principal of the College. We have already met with the latter as one of the editors of the "Prospective Review," and in other connections; but it is now time to note what manner of man he was. He was Mr. Martineau's senior by nearly eight years. Like him, he had, through his grandmother, a strain of French Huguenot blood in his veins. If those who are fond of tracing the influence of heredity can find in this fact a reason why the two men were so congenial, it must not blind us to the great differences by which they were distinguished from one another. So obvious were these differences that students who incurred the terrible charge of being microscopic imitations of Tayler and Martineau used to wonder how they could resemble both; but the resemblance implied in this charge probably meant no more than that they both read German theology, and entertained a highly spiritual, which meant a very hazy and sentimental, view of religion. Mr. Tayler's grave and earnest face, though sometimes catching the light of gentle smiles and laughter, was just touched with a look of sadness left by the recent loss of his only son, a young barrister of great promise. To the students he was all kindness and consideration, so that no one feared to approach him; yet no one took advantage of this, for the nobility of his character and the extent of his accomplishments commanded universal respect, and in some men far deeper feelings than respect. His nature was pervaded by a spirit of devotion, which imparted to him a saintly simplicity and sweetness; and whatever view may be taken of his theology, no one who could look beneath the surface would deny that he was, at heart, a Christian indeed in whom was no guile.

This beauty of character was combined with large scholarship, and with an intellect capable of wide and deep thinking. Nevertheless in intellectual power and impressiveness he was not the peer of his younger colleague. There was sometimes a certain timidity in the expression of his opinions, which was due to his candid love of truth and the breadth of his outlook. Truth, he constantly said, had not one side, but many sides; and he seemed often to feel that much might be urged against his own conclusions, and that there might be some aspect of the question at issue that he had failed to observe. If this humility of search and judgment had a valuable effect in silently rebuking the self-confident dogmatism of youth, it sometimes had a depressing influence, making all religious problems appear too complex for any trustworthy solution. The consequence was that, in some cases at least, Mr. Tayler's finest qualities were not fully appreciated till the students had left the College, and the total and combined impression of the man stamped itself on the memory. It was quite otherwise with Mr. Martineau. Equally candid, and equally respecting the liberty of his pupils, he knew his own mind. The students felt that they were not only listening to a brilliant exposition, but were in presence of one who had mastered his subject, who had carefully thought out every problem for himself, and occupied his ground with a well-based confidence; and if they found it less easy to approach him, they expected, not indeed greater tenderness, but more complete sympathy and insight. They were sure that the precise point of any difficulty would be understood, and the weak spot in any faulty conclusion made clear. But the differences in the temperament and power of the colleagues only helped to adapt them more perfectly to one another. Mr. Martineau had the deepest reverence for his Principal, and, with his more intimate knowledge, gives him a higher intellectual rank

than the foregoing sketch would suggest. He says that "Mr. Tayler has been the English Schleiermacher. How much that implies; what a vast and well-organised conception of the theological sciences in themselves and in their relations; what a living sense of religion animating them all, and redeeming them from erudite dryness; what patient scholarship; what acute critical discernment; what grasp of the essence and free handling of the forms of Christian life; what elevation above both prejudice and fear, — will be understood by all who are familiar with the greatest German divine since the Reformation." He adds that "if Mr. Tayler's dialectical and speculative skill was less marked than Schleiermacher's, his critical judgment was less fanciful, and his historical feeling both sounder in itself and directed by more thorough archæological and literary knowledge." [1]

Two letters, written by Mr. Martineau to his friend, the Rev. W. R. Alger, soon after the removal to London, throw light upon the thoughts and feelings with which he left Liverpool, and entered on his new duties: —

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Sept. 28, 1857.

My dear Mr. Alger, — My manifold debts to you I must be content to acknowledge without pretending to pay. You will see from my new address something of the distracting claims which have interfered with my regularity of correspondence. In this conservative country it is no light thing for a man of not unfaithful affections to break up the home of five-and-twenty years, and pitch his tent anew, — especially when he has to move upon his way through skirmish and ambuscade, and clear for himself a pathway as he goes. I trust that time and better knowledge will subdue the rancorous opposition on the part of a few through which I have to pass to my new duties here; but for the moment it gives me a new and painful

[1] From "In Memoriam, Rev. John James Tayler, B.A.," 1869, reprinted in Essays, I. The whole should be read by those who wish for further knowledge of Mr. Tayler; and also the preface to Mr. Thom's edition of his letters, 1872, as well as the letters themselves.

experience of the unscrupulous and self-deceiving character of theological antipathy. Happily, with like-minded associates, and the entire confidence of the College authorities, there is good hope of final conquest over all difficulties.

The deeper the shade of detraction at home, the more consolatory, you will readily believe, is a friendly and appreciative word from abroad. Were I younger and vainer, Mr. Starr King's glowing and elaborate article might spoil me. But from my advanced post of life I find it not difficult to be grateful without elation, and to accept the sympathy, without appropriating the praises, of a younger generation of friends. The faults indicated and complained of I know to be real; the counterbalancing good assigned to me will serve to direct my aims and sustain the standard of all future work. The whole number of the "Examiner" promises well. The only anxiety I feel about it is, lest, with its higher and more genial tone of feeling, it should recede too far from the sober and scholarly style of the "elder school." Pretty advice, you will say, to come from me! but no counsel is more sincere than that which cannot be given without condemning oneself.

. . . . . .

It is very strange to me to find my preaching days come to an end, and to subside into the layman's habit all at once. The release from Sunday duty has revived the hope of realising certain plans of more systematic production than has hitherto been possible. If life be continued and the present persecution overcome, I shall not despair of executing here a scheme of philosophical construction already partially worked out in many of its principal features, and in its ground-plan long laid down.

It is a great satisfaction to have left my people in charge of my friend W. H. Channing for a year. No arrangement could have been so secure and good. He has won golden opinions in Liverpool and in England generally by his faultless dispositions and his free mind and heart, even where his opinions are but little accepted. His residence among us has done us much good. Farewell, dear Mr. Alger; do not believe any evil of me, whatever the "Christian Reformer" and "Inquirer" may say.

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Dec. 31, 1857.

My dear Mr. Alger, — The last moments of the retiring year cannot be better spent than in words of grateful acknowledgment for your precious letter of last month, and of answer

to the questions it contains. Whatever reproaches for neglect my conscience may carry as its burthen into a new time, you shall not be associated with them, if I can help it. Accept my heart's greetings on the threshold of the year. May it bring you every blessing which a wise and Christian man can venture to desire, and even where the least "happy," be full of sacred significance! By all ordinary rules of reckoning you ought to pass the line from year to year with more hopeful step than I; yet somehow — God be praised — the natural lapse of life seems to me no evil, and the future — whether *here* or *there* — looks to me as fresh and bright as it ever did. My friend and successor, W. H. Channing, preaches that "*old age is a delusion*"; and I do not think he will change his doctrine when he has reached my stage. The last year, however, has been a great crisis to me, and transferred me to the last period of active service; not without opposing storms unknown to me before. Their strength is not yet fully spent; and it is not impossible that they may sweep me away from the field of my work. But if, as I rather expect, they blow over and disappear, there is plenty of honourable and congenial labour before me to fill and animate the remaining years of life. The Annual Meeting of our College Trustees (held on the 21st January) will probably clear up everything, — expose the absurdity of the recent animosity, and enable us to work in peace. This alone is wanting to satisfy our moderate desires. Our students are sufficiently numerous, and of exemplary zeal and disposition. My friend and colleague, J. J. Tayler, is universally admired and revered for his rare graces of mind and character, and secures the dignity of the Institution of which he is the Head. We are so entirely like-minded and like-hearted in all that affects our joint feeling and action, that there is but one will between us. And in our younger coadjutor — my son Russell (with whose appointment, you will believe, I had no more to do than President Buchanan, and who never offered himself at all, but was sent for and elected without any candidateship) — we have a thoroughly trained scholar, adequately representing in its breadth the modern Oriental philology, and peculiarly uniting precision and enthusiasm in his pursuits. So amongst us we hope to do something for the advancement of sacred studies in our small sphere.

At present, dear friend, the pressure of new work is too severe upon me to admit of any writing except for my classroom; and I am constrained to decline, almost wholly, even

occasional preaching; having never entered a pulpit or stood upon a platform since I left Liverpool. I have been considering, however, whether I could not find something suitable to add to the volume on "Sacerdotal and Spiritual Christianity."[1] And I propose to send you, as soon as I can revise and write out, a discourse originally entitled "Sinful Doctrines of Sin."[2] It develops the consequences, in relation to the prevailing theology of the Personal nature of sin; and harmonizes with the other papers of the intended volume in being at once critical and constructive. It will not add as much as you desire to the bulk of the volume, but it is longer than an ordinary sermon. Had I been on your Committee of Selection, I should have voted for the exclusion from the volume of "Peace in Division"; and the introduction instead of the "Christian View of Moral Evil." But doubtless other judgments are better.

I am gratified by Dr. Hedge's willingness to give me a place in the "Examiner." I am far from saying that I shall never remind him of his promise; but for a while I must regard myself as unreservedly due to academic claims.

Mr. Giles's[3] message affected me much. His name recalls a thousand kindly and interesting memories; and it is delightful to hear from you a report of him that precisely renews and continues the old charm. If you see him give him kindest greetings from me; and say how glad I was to see his handwriting in a letter delivered by his astronomical friend just at the moment of my leaving Liverpool. I had no house over my head at the time, and could do no honour to his introduction; and have heard nothing of his friend since.

The discourse referred to in the second of these letters is a sermon on 1 Timothy i. 5: "Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." It is assumed that this Epistle is the work of the Apostle Paul, though at a later time he regarded the spuriousness of the Pastoral Epistles as fully established. The object of the discourse

[1] The volume published in London under the title of "Studies of Christianity." I have not seen the American edition. — J. D.

[2] Appearing in the volume as "Sin; what it is, what it is not."

[3] One of the three champions in the Liverpool Controversy.

is to insist on the "personal nature of sin," by which he meant that "*each man is a person, and not a thing;* and that *his sin is his own, and not another's.*" In evidence of this he states briefly, but with perfect distinctness, the doctrine which is elaborated in his great work on ethics, and then applies it in refutation of the doctrines of different schools, that men are totally depraved, that they are through and through the creatures of circumstance, and that guilt and merit can be transferred. He finds "remission of sins," not in rescue from the penal laws of God, but in conversion to an inner sympathy with God, when "the averted face of the Infinite has turned round upon us again; and the pure eyes look into us with a mild and loving gaze, which we can meet with answering glance, and feel that we are at one with the universe and reconciled with God."

Congreve's translation of the "Catechism of Positive Religion" supplied him with an occasion for an elaborate criticism of "Comte's Life and Philosophy,"[1] which appeared in the "National Review" for July, 1858. This must be reserved for future notice.

The succeeding number contained an article on "Professional Religion,"[2] which ought to be pondered by every student for the ministry. It begins with a notice of several recent books, including "Scenes from Clerical Life." His critical sagacity has not detected the sex of the author; but he tells us that "Mr. Eliot's strength lies in the conception of female character." The leading object of the essay is to explain the "very feeble hold of the world" possessed by the ministers of religion. It is not due, as one of the books suggests, to mere faults of elocution, nor to be cured by "nice doses of rhetorical breath," which would deprive the chief of all realities of a first-

[1] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," and in Essays, I.
[2] Reprinted in Essays, II.

hand simplicity. It must be traced to "a fatal variance between the *represented* and the *real* religion of the living generation." This may be owing partly to the very breadth of opportunity enjoyed by the teachers of religion, "too great for a definite official class to occupy with success." Distinct duties and powers are provided for a priesthood; but in spite of Anglican attempts, sacerdotal mediation has vanished from modern Christendom. The existence of a clerical profession rests upon a twofold need. The recorded letter of divine truth requires a learned ministry, with ripe scholarship and disciplined thought, to snatch men from the tyranny and isolation of their own age. But this culture must have no insincerities and reservations, no obligation to certain critical and dogmatic results; for a man in the stocks cannot rise up and show you the way. There is also the unwritten Word, the appeal to the Living Witness of God in our humanity, which demands the prophet's voice. "The dim and mystic zone of our higher nature, where the human meets with the Divine, grows so clear to some, that they can divide the light from the darkness, and turn what to us is a confused chaos into a firmament of stars." The prophetic power is a gift, whereas learning must be acquired; but there is no incompatibility between the two, and the former should be eager for the yoke of patient discipline. "The native prophetic fire often burns into false heats of impatience and presumption upon young hearts, and tempts them to decline the toils and despise the discipline of steady culture. But this belongs to its human infirmity, not to its divine excellence; and entails the vitiating curse inseparable from pride and conceit." The article then proceeds to consider the sources of the actual feebleness of the ministry, and to show that the conditions imposed upon preachers are enough to suppress the clearest religious genius, and that no mind of the first order could move

freely under the weight of dogma it is expected to carry. There is also the inherent danger which besets an official class, of losing the primary devoutness in a "concern for religion," which busies itself with analysing and estimating either other people's religion, or else its own, and makes party ties partake more of corporate egotism than of personal affection. Accordingly there is an "unorganised religion sleeping or struggling in men's hearts beyond the circle of the organised," and in spite of disaffection towards the churches, the writer doubts "whether the hearts of Englishmen were ever more prepared for being drawn together by common sentiments of reverence, conscience, and aspiration."

His address this year at the opening of the College Session in October bears the title: "Plea for Biblical Studies and Something More."[1] Beginning with an allusion to the recent death of Mr. Wellbeloved, whom he describes in words of reverent appreciation, he took the opportunity of referring to the conflict through which he and his colleague had passed. As successors of such men as Wellbeloved and Kenrick they were bound to keep as near as they could to the front ranks of advancing research in their respective fields; but as they were marching in allegiance to the same Divine Master, they expected a generous trust. The problem of the College had always been to reconcile the interests of free learning with the practical training for the Christian ministry; and its supporters had been too noble-minded to indulge a suspicion that these two ends should be incompatible. Proceeding to note the most essential changes in the aspect of their educational problem, he sketched the old doctrine of biblical infallibility, with the branches of learning which it necessitated, and found sufficient; and then described the change which had been brought about by natural science, comparative

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

philology, and historical criticism. Owing to this change a critique had to be found for the Matter of Scripture, in addition to the interpretation of its words; and the instruments of this critique were the sciences of nature, the verdicts of conscience, and the indications of history. The general result was that with the Divine element of Scripture they had to recognise the human, and from the human world beyond the range of Scripture we were less eager to exclude the Divine; and so all history was drawn into the drama of divine revelation. In unfolding these views he for a moment draws the curtain from his own past life, and shows once more how the growth in his theology was largely the result of his own natural experiences, which had not been so spoiled by artificial restraints as to become inoperative: "I well remember (perhaps it is only a personal confession which I make) the half-guilty feeling with which, in young and fervent days, I found myself surprised into passionate admiration of the story of Socrates, and taken captive by words that seemed to me of unspeakable religious depth in Plato, or even in Cicero and Seneca. I accused myself of an unchristian perversity, — a want of evangelical simplicity and humbleness, — because often Greek and Roman history stirred the tides within me more than the image of Galilean Apostles, — because the struggle for Hellenic freedom appeared more sacred than the conquest of idolatrous Canaan, and Leonidas nobler than Gideon, — because, read what I might in favour of a general resurrection in the body, the Phaedon tempted me to hope rather for the immortality of the soul. Every beauty and good that fastened wonder or reverence on a world reputed alien from God, was felt to detract from the glories of his chosen sphere, and to weaken that contrast between a profane and a sacred realm on which everything was staked. The time is surely come when these artificial anxieties may disappear."

The length of the College vacation enabled Mr. Martineau to extend to three months the period of his country retreat. He spent this summer on the coast of Cornwall, and the following letter to Mr. Tayler, who was staying in Germany, gives a picturesque account of his surroundings, and throws a valuable light upon the thoughts with which his mind was occupied: —

WEST PENTIRE, Aug. 15, 1858.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — Just as I was beginning to pine for tidings of you came your letter, so bright and refreshing as to be a vacation in itself. It is delightful to know that you have found so congenial a rest, and feel at once a rebound from the oppressive weight of the London summer Term. Though your present neighbourhood is unknown to me, there are a few points in your description of your journey that touch the memories of ten years ago. Especially have I a pleasant remembrance of Dr. Bethmann, whom I met more than once at Dr. Pertz's house, and who must have been, I think, at that time, in the Berlin library. He occupies a place once filled by one of the most original and comprehensive thinkers, surely, that ever tried the great problem of Historical Religion. Lessing and Schleiermacher appear to me to stand far above all other men of the last few generations in their apprehension of the organic principles of a scientific theology. It is the precious privilege of our vacation that we really can escape into communion with such minds from the fret and dust of sectarian anxieties, and see something beyond the circle of too near a life. But when I half long to be with you and enjoy the further aid of your constant counsel and a foreign scene, I console myself with the thought that it stops scandal for one of us to be content with England. What would our friends . . . and . . . augur for the College if *both* its Professors ran off to Germany as soon as the Session was over, to get up their work for the next? And, after all, this place, on which I ventured rather at hap-hazard, suits us remarkably well. Its complete retirement — amid about half a dozen small farmhouses ten or twelve miles from any town — would be objectionable except to a largish family having some variety of resource among themselves; but we find it unspeakably refreshing. The one impressive feature of the whole district is the grandeur of the coast line; — a lofty bulwark

of contorted slate rocks, throwing out rugged headlands and islands into the sea, perforated with tremendous caverns coloured like a fancy grotto; and intersected here and there with picturesque veins of quartz and dykes of porphyry. With a clear Atlantic line that strikes no land to the West short of America, we have a sea of stainless purity and inconceivable brilliancy of colour. . . . Inland the country is somewhat dreary from want of wood, though its outline is varied and its surface, where undefiled by mining operations, well cultivated. Nothing can be more delightful than the climate, so far as we have experienced it; fresh and bracing, without the harshness and dryness of the air upon the Eastern coast. What with the sea-breeze and a good swim through the waves every day, we hope to find ourselves, at the three months' end, pretty well salted-up for winter use. . . . There is something in the Cornish people which particularly pleases us, — a balance of independence and kindly politeness, equally removed from the rudeness of Lancashire and the servile smoothness of the Southern peasantry. Even the mining population, usually the least civilised, presents a striking contrast to the corresponding class in Staffordshire and Wales; and has never again descended to the level from which John Wesley raised them. Methodism, though it has forfeited popular regard by its hierarchical ambition, still wields greater power as a habit and tradition than the Church exercises as a living body; and the clergyman of this place (where Methodism is exceptionally weak) himself told me — in answer to a remark about the apparent absence of *schools* in the neighbourhood — that almost everything in the way of popular education in the country was done by the Dissenters.

My meditation every day, dear friend, is almost exclusively of the work, under some aspect or other, to which we are jointly — and I trust for the whole remainder of our active life — committed. Through the goodness of God I find myself in something like the position which, from my youth up, has seemed to me the most desirable concluding stage of an active career; — the associate, in congenial Academic labour, for ends distinctively Christian, of the one only man for whom, in such a partnership, I could feel an unconditional trust as my guide, and affectionate admiration as my model in all sorts of things as yet beyond me. The very ideal of opportunity seems come, according to the measure of my early dreams; — all the more awful is the doubt whether I have faculty and fidelity to do my part in it; or whether I

shall disappoint you in the hopes you have so good a right to form. I do really believe that the time is ripe for a great enlargement of theological view in connexion with a deepening of Christian faith among thoughtful persons in this country. Nor do I much doubt that you and I have been brought into a state of mind fitting us in some respects to aid this change in our own circle. If we had ten years of systematic College teaching, Pulpit Services, and Publication, I do suppose we might leave our generation not without some impression of what we deem a higher faith and purer philosophy. At times I look forward to such a possibility with sanguine hope and joy; and then again, under some shadow of self-distrust and despondency it vanishes as a presumptuous delusion. There is perhaps ground for permanent and serious doubt whether the religious body which supplies us with our basis of work will entrust us with the requisite freedom, or has itself a sufficient future before it, to give occasion and support for such improvement as we desire. But on this it is idle to speculate; the conditions are assigned to us by Providence, and we must reduce their difficulties, and apply their resources as we can. And I completely feel with you that nothing is so immediately urgent as the supply to our pulpits of a few men trained by us to unite the intellectual habits of the scholar with the practical earnestness and power of the Christian preacher and pastor. . . . The theological students, I quite think, require to be spared so much copying of notes; it is altogether a vicious system, for which nothing can be said. Perhaps, however, it is not necessary, in order to change it, that the practice of *Lecturing* should be relinquished in favour of printed Text-books as the basis of a course of reading. A teacher has two things to do in his class: viz. (1) to open up the *existing literature* of his subject; and (2) to bring *the action of his own mind* to bear upon it. The question is, how best he can combine these objects. He may either construct and present out of his own thought the *main organism* of his subject; and then, as he takes up one member of it after another, expound and compare the chief judgments of standard writers on the topics it includes; or, he may adopt the organic frame-work from some established author, to whose text he must, in that case, leave the selection and critical report of other related types of opinion; and then, he will add on his own part by way of corrective and supplementary annotation. Now all my work has been done on the former principle. Every course is *essen-*

tially constructive, and *filled in* with historical and critical abstracts of the most important schools of opinion, — opposite or allied. To invert this order — to let some given author (Reid, for example) do the construction, whilst I became his annotator — would require me to begin over again, and practically throw out of use every page I have ever written. Nor, in dealing with subjects of inward and reflective apprehension, does it seem to me possible for the Teacher to do his duty simply as critical and judicial annotator. Where everything depends so much on First Principles, Method, Intellectual Form, and so little in comparison on the Matter, taken in detail, he cannot well dispense with the independent elaboration of his own scheme, or, if he has once formed it, break it into footnotes and excursus without destroying its evidence and vitality. The very epitomes and critiques of opinion, largely interspersed in each course, would cease to be intelligible or available, if transposed to suit the order of a printed Text-book; referring, as they necessarily do, to prior sections in my own order. I do not see my way, therefore, to any material change in the method of prelection hitherto adopted. But the same end may be gained by very simple means, viz. absolutely discouraging the practice of copying out notes. When I was at College, we took such notes as we could *at the time,* and found them quite sufficient, though the lectures were read much faster than at present. There is no reason why our students should not do the same; and I quite intend to quicken my rate of reading so as to render verbatim reports impossible, and induce the class to rely on intelligent listening, resulting in abstracts made during the hour, and supplemented by reading a certain portion of the references. Should I be able, within reasonable time, to bring out (as I venture to hope) a short systematic Text-book on each of the three Departments under my care, — Mental, Moral, Religious philosophy, in preparation for more extended treatment of at least the Ethics in an ulterior work, — I could then reduce the lecturing within much smaller compass, and the difficulty would be effectually met. . . . If, whilst we are educating a dozen students, those who distrust us are educating all the rest of our public, there is inevitable jar and discord in preparation. I confess that, on this account, I regret the Sunday silence to which we are doomed, and should look with much hope to its removal, though the burthen of preaching, congenial as it is, is ever full of manifold travail and sorrow to me. In both of us, dear friend,

all ambition, in any self-seeking sense, is dead, I do believe. But the older we grow, the more may we naturally feel an anxiety — surely not unholy — to spend and apply all that is in us in the service of a world we must soon quit."

The opportunity of influencing a wider public through the ministrations of the pulpit was unexpectedly opened. On the 12th of October his old friend, the Rev. Edward Tagart, minister of Little Portland Street Chapel, died at Brussels, on his way home from a visit to Transylvania. Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau were earnestly pressed to accept, as colleagues, the vacant office; and, after some hesitation, due to the uncertainty of their obligations to the College Committee, the invitation was accepted. Before accepting, however, they thought it necessary to satisfy themselves as to the demands of the Trust-deed, and they wrote a letter to the representatives of the congregation in which they clearly defined their position. They stated that their religious views were those of "Unitarian Christianity," and that they would not "shrink, on suitable occasions, from asserting them in undisguised simplicity, and exhibiting them in the light best fitted to recommend them to the reason, conscience, and affections" of their fellow-men. But they desired to hold them with entire freedom, feeling that such doctrinal freedom was "most consonant with a religious confidence in the power of simple truth, and most in accordance with the broad principle and catholic spirit" of their Presbyterian forefathers. The required assurance was given "that the constitution of the congregation was free from restrictive conditions," and in harmony with their expressed wish.[1] Their ministry began on the 20th of February in the following year. It was understood that, in consideration of their other engagements, only slight demands should be

[1] "The Christian Reformer," 1860, p. 113 *sq.*

made upon them for pastoral duties in addition to the public services. How little they spared themselves will appear from the following account, by Mr. Martineau,[1] of the general character of his ministry: —

"Bringing to it, in both instances, Lancashire habits and ideas, we did not feel satisfied till the Little Portland Street congregation, besides assembling for stated worship, had looked with a Christian eye upon its neighbourhood and made itself the centre of improved culture and kindly offices to the poorer population around. Through the generous response which was quickly made to our appeal, the small Sunday school which had already been formed under Mr. Tayler's impulse expanded into the noble set of Day and Sunday Schools now known as among the best in London. In these schools Mr. Tayler never ceased to feel the most lively practical interest. But before two years had elapsed, he found the public services of the Chapel, though reduced to one in the day, too great a strain upon his strength, after the week's labours in his lecture-room. For a little while he yielded to my earnest entreaty and postponed his purpose of retirement; but soon left the congregation to my sole charge. If this was a promotion, it was to me a sad and anxious one. Not only had I leaned, with affectionate confidence, on the support and co-operation of my senior, and taken whatever tasks he wished to leave me, but had found, in his preaching, at once intellectual and saintly, a refreshment and delight never to be repeated; and no change could be more grievous to me than the prospect of hearing thenceforth no voice but my own.

"Nothing, however, remained for me, in this relation, but to work out, as far as possible, the aim which had always guided me, of separating, and yet combining, the prophetic and the teaching functions of the Christian ministry. The hours set apart for public worship should be absolutely surrendered, as it seems to me, to devout thought and utterance, and the consecration of human life by Divine affections; and as a rule I could never, without feeling myself guilty of an abuse, treat the pulpit as a lecturer's platform, for didactic exposition, critical discussion, or philosophical speculation. Whoever occupies that place stands there as the organ of the common Christian feeling; to this he must freely lend his individuality, becoming only as the first voice in the chorus

[1] Bi. Mem.

of consentient trust and aspiration. Yet he has also to exercise a gift of teaching. He administers a Religion grounded in the Reason and Conscience, developed in history, summed up in doctrines, embodied in churches, applied in life; and in all these relations it must be enabled to know and to amend itself. To conduct this studious and discriminative process, he needs separate hours, a totally different mood and method, and an audience of those alone who are open to systematic reading and reflection on questions of morals and theology. All this part of my work I habitually withdrew from the pulpit and threw into courses of weekly lectures. Twice, indeed, — once in Liverpool and once in London, — I broke through this rule; and, having reached in each case a stage of theological opinion considerably removed from my starting point, felt it my duty to define anew the component lines and forms of religious truth, and set them clear of encumbering appendages. But in thus attempting 'Liberare animam meam,' I limited the sermon, as far as possible, to the positive elements of spiritual faith, and reserved for the lecture-room the apparatus and process of proof and refutation. In this way, there passed under review, in the last ten years of my ministry, — the theory and essence of Religion, the Hellenic, Hebrew, and Medieval varieties, the basis and system of Morals, the conditions and evidence of Revelation from the Divine to the Human mind, the growth of the Messianic doctrine, the origin of the New Testament literature, the interpretation of the chief Pauline Epistles, of the Acts of the Apostles, of the Book of Revelation, of the Synoptical Gospels as recording the life of Christ, and the source, age, and significance of the Johannine doctrine of his person. My own volumes of notes make me only too well aware how imperfectly these subjects were treated: but, at any rate, one who wished to pursue them was furnished with sufficient guidance to work out his own way wherever I had left him in the dark."

This year witnessed the publication of two philosophical essays; one on Mansel's "Limits of Religious Thought," in the January number, and one on J. S. Mill's "Dissertations and Discussions," in the October number of the "National Review." [1] The April number contained a no-

[1] Both reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," and in Essays, III.

tice of Schleiermacher's "Life and Times."[1] Mr. Martineau avoids entering into a critical estimate of the great theologian's views, and devotes far the larger part of the article to a delightful sketch of his life, interspersed with extracts from his correspondence. He does not fail, however, to indicate his mental characteristics in a few suggestive words: "The greatness of Schleiermacher as a theologian arises less from any specific force of genius than from the compass and balance of his mind. His intellectual appetite was omnivorous. . . . It is less, however, the completeness of his intellectual accomplishment than the interfusion through it all of a paramount religious feeling, that determined the form of his theology, by giving it an inner centre, whence it worked creatively outwards in all directions and compelled the whole matter of thought and knowledge to feel the pulsations of a common heart." "He was far above the stupid impiety of intellectual fear on God's behalf." "Few, we believe, will now deny that, in claiming an independent ground of religion, in delivering it from its contingent existence as a derivative inference of science, or a necessary sanction of morals, or a critical conclusion from testimony, Schleiermacher lifted it into a higher region, and restored to it its own." At the same time he points out that his "appeal to the mystic sense of Divine Immanence in the world incurred some danger of melting away the personality of both God and man."

In "The Christian Reformer" for December, 1858, appeared a letter to the editor, entitled "An Attempt to Define the Unitarian Position." This able and clearly written letter had the signature S. F. M., letters which stood for the Rev. S. F. Macdonald, the Unitarian minister at Chester. The writer dealt first with a view which

[1] Reprinted in Essays, I.

he said certainly obtained in many quarters, "viz., that it is of the essence of the Unitarian Church to have no clearly-defined opinions." This seemed to him "a most singular notion," and he expressed his astonishment that "our leading minds" should entertain it. "Our leading minds," no doubt, meant pre-eminently Mr. Martineau, though the question how so many men otherwise intelligent came to regard him as a man of vague and nebulous intellect, incapable of forming and expressing definite convictions, would furnish a curious problem in mental pathology. The letter was afterwards printed separately, and circulated by its author; and, among others, Mr. Martineau, who was spending the summer at Castletown of Braemar, received a copy. In acknowledging it on August 6, he wrote Mr. Macdonald a long letter on "The Unitarian Position," which was afterwards printed in "The Inquirer" of Aug. 27, 1859, and again in "The Christian Reformer" of the following October. The letter is perfectly lucid, and its meaning was readily apprehended by Mr. Macdonald. But it was widely misunderstood; for theological suspicion seems generally to carry about with it a certain amount of "invincible ignorance." Mr. Martineau, therefore, deemed it necessary to reply to his critics, which he did in a more elaborate letter, dated October 14, and entitled "Church-life? or Sect-life?"[1] These two letters explain with perfect clearness his views as to the relation which theology bears to the life of a Church, and should be carefully studied by those who really desire to understand his position. That position is stated, in the opening of the second letter, in a series of concise propositions, which are then carefully explained and defended. No better summary can be presented here than these propositions: —

[1] Both letters are reprinted in Essays, II.

I. i. Though for individual believers definite theological conviction is important to the spiritual life; and
ii. For simultaneous fellow-worshippers a corresponding theological sympathy is indispensable;

II. i. Yet it is wrong for permanent Churches to fix their standard of belief, and commit their religious life to the hazards of a specific type of doctrine; and
ii. *We,* in particular, cannot do so without
1. Re-adopting that notion of "*orthodoxy*" (as entering into the relation between God and man) which we profess to reject;
2. Compelling our Church-sympathies and our natural reverence often to run across each other;
3. Breaking with the Past from which we spring; and
4. Compromising the Future which we prepare.

III. Hence we should beware of
i. Accepting any doctrinal organisation, however useful its functions in other respects, as representative organ of our group of congregations; and of
ii. Distinguishing ourselves ecclesiastically from The General Christian Church by any name, unless expressing
1. Either our historical origin,
2. Or our refusal to limit God's grace in Christ by dogmatic conditions.

The proposition III. i. refers to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which at that time admitted congregations, as distinct from individuals, to its membership, and thereby appeared to set up a claim to be their representative organ. As we have seen, Mr. Martineau had formerly entertained no objection to such a constitution; but his views had been changed, or, as he himself says, his eyes had been opened, by the Lady Hewley case, which brought out into clear light the history and essential basis of the old English Presbyterian Churches. On this ground he had felt himself compelled, the previous March, to decline an invitation to preside at the Annual Meeting of the Association. His objection to dogmatic restrictions

in the Trust Deeds of Chapels or Societies extended to the use of a doctrinal name; and, while he freely accepted the term "Unitarian" as descriptive of a certain type of theology, and as applicable to individuals who held that theology, he believed that it was improperly applied to a Church in which there had been, and might still be, a progressive change of theological conviction. He says: "The habitual use of a doctrinal designation applied to a worshipping society, or to any group of such societies, its employment in public documents (such as petitions to Parliament) proceeding from the body, cannot fail, even in the absence of limiting conditions in the Trust Deeds, to fix a certain stereotyped character upon the body, and to mask any wider latitude which its legal constitution may really possess. This alone is enough to check the spontaneous course of gradual change, to which surely the conservatism of reverential prepossession presents sufficient natural resistance." If there was to be any common name, it should be "flexible and expansive"; but, he says, "not being anxious to form a sect, but only, till better days, to keep open and unexclusive some little corner in the Church meant to be Universal, I am quite content with a stock of provisional and accidental names. The mere fact that we inherit no other expresses the very genius of the large-hearted and self-renouncing Christianity from which we spring." The world, with its idea of a saving orthodoxy, would perhaps describe them as "Unitarian" or "Socinian"; but, he says, "it belongs to our ecclesiastical protest against the whole notion of orthodoxy to accept neither; to insist on deposing the differences of creed from their monstrous usurpation; to draw forth into just prominence the spiritual and moral conditions in which alone our relation to God is realised; and in the name of Christ to proclaim a Church of goodness, love, and heavenly-mindedness." One or two fur-

ther passages may be quoted which, in combination with others, may help to correct some curious misapprehensions. While he speaks of a spiritual necessity urging every earnest and thoughtful man to definite convictions, he says: "Without presuming to deny that an opposite order is possible, viz., logical thinking first and a suitable kindling of affection afterwards, I believe the general fact to be that Feeling goes before Idea . . . and the season of deepest faith and worship is prior to the analysis of notions and determination of creed." On another subject he makes an earnest protest: "If there is one modern tendency more than another against which I have striven through life, with the united earnestness of natural instinct and deliberate conviction, it is the extreme Individualism which turns our foremost politics, philosophy, religion into a humiliating caricature." The function of a Church is thus defined: "Christianity is a divine dispensation for bringing men into conscious union with the Holiest of all, with the Father through the Son; a Church is an institution embodying and applying the distinctively Christian requisites to this end, — the dying away to sin and self, and the rising into strength, goodness, and love by filial surrender to the Perfect Will."

Before quitting this year we may steal a look at him in his mountain home in Braemar during the long vacation. He writes to Mr. Tayler: —

July 27, 1859.

"I shall hope soon to hear from you that your English retreat is not less delightful and renovating to you all than we find our nest in the Grampians. The change is indeed unspeakably great from the mighty wilderness of stifling streets to the cool and breezy upland, silent but for the tumble of the torrent in its bed, and the sweep of the wind through the birch and pine forest on the mountain-sides. The country here, compared with our Lake district, is built, as it were, on a great scale, — the valleys wide, the hill-sides, — which are covered below, bare above, — vast and solemn; — and the

loftier heights, as in all granitic regions, rather massive and rounded than running up into peaks, like the Langdale and Sca Fell Pikes. As our village is more than 1100 feet above the sea, we are almost mountaineers to begin with, and snow still visible from within a few paces of our house-door gives tolerable assurance of our exemption from the heats elsewhere so oppressive. The only want I ever feel is of just a studious and sympathising friend, like yourself, to stimulate me by exchange of thoughts on the topics with which books and meditation charge me."

The following year had disappointment and trial in store. He received an invitation to visit the United States of America, and on the 22d of June, 1860, he wrote to his friend Mr. Alger: —

10 Gordon Street, W. C.

My dear Mr. Alger, — Audacious as it seems to me, it is yet true that I have ventured to accept the great invitation. I have barely time by this mail to thank you for your letter, so hearty in its offer of welcome, yet so generously leaving me free. I cannot yet form plans definitely. But I incline to sail, about the second week in August, for *Quebec* direct; and after taking the Canada line to Niagara, to work my way to Boston for a moderate sojourn, prior to the Convention at New York, which will close the scene. As I shall not be without obligations of work, I have declined the friendly invitations given me to be the guests at private homes, and have made up my mind to take a quiet lodging in or near Boston. This will enable me to devote the morning hours to solitary study, and free my conscience for social enjoyment of friendly converse during the latter part of each day.

Especially will this arrangement be indispensable should there arise, as you suggest, any call on me to lecture whilst I am among you. But I lay all these matters before you very much with a view to help and correction from your better knowledge of the local fitness of things.

. . . . . .

Ever faithfully and cordially yours,
James Martineau.

His hopes, however, were not destined to be fulfilled. As early as the summer of the previous year his colleague,

Mr. Tayler, was beginning to feel that his duties at Little Portland Street put too great a strain upon his strength; and Mr. Martineau suggested that, in order to relieve the tension, the evening service should be given up, since, owing to the distance of the Chapel from the residences of the congregation, it appeared to him to meet no real want. In 1860 Mr. Tayler had a serious illness, and Mr. Martineau, always considerate, felt that it would not be right to desert him even for a short period after the opening of the College session. A letter to Mr. Alger recounts his change of plan: —

AUCHRANNIE, INVERCLOY, ARRAN, SCOTLAND, Aug. 1, 1860.

MY DEAR MR. ALGER:

κεναῖσιν ἐλπίσιν θερμαίνεται,

vulgo,

There 's many a slip
'Twixt the cup and the lip!

and my promised draught is dashed from my hand for this season at least. I have been obliged to write to Mr. Hale, and at the last moment before securing my passage, retract my acceptance of the invitation so generously given. My colleague and dear friend, Mr. Tayler, who has so eagerly forwarded the project of my visit, has not made such rapid progress towards recovery as would justify me in leaving him to conduct our College single-handed through the first weeks of a new session; and both his physician and the officers of the College have withdrawn the encouragement which at first they gave me to accept the Convention invitation. In the face of this change, which quite corresponds with my own misgivings, no course is open to me but to remain at my post, and send my heartfelt thanks, my deep regrets, and my prayer for kind construction on a seeming unfaithfulness, to my honoured friends in New England. Most of all my acknowledgments are due to you for the considerate arrangements contemplated by you for my visit. I take pleasure in fancying that perhaps they may be only postponed, and that, with longer foresight of them, I may make worthier use of them. This year I might perhaps have been able to answer the demands, if made, of the Lowell Institute, and give a few lectures on Ethical Theories. But all my materials being *Academic,* not

popular, in their form, as well as systematic in their continuity, I could hardly have availed myself of your suggestion as to detached lectures in different cities. I admire, but cannot emulate, the happy facility with which, in your more eager social life, you can throw off an address, at once instructive and fascinating, like that of which you send me an epitome. Were I to try such a thing, the result would be humiliating: after reading for a year, and meditating for a month, I should produce a lucubration which would empty any lecture-room in ten minutes. We want more of your broad popular life to cure our morbid fastidiousness.

Dr. Putnam's and Dr. Walker's appreciation touches me deeply; and with or without result, confers on me the honour I most prize, — the esteem of men wiser and better than myself. Should their design take effect, I should like my acknowledgment to be, the publication in your Country, perhaps during or after a personal visit thither, of something sufficiently systematic and considerable in scope to justify their recognition of me. So at least I dream at this moment, when I stand in need of a little hope to console my immediate disappointment.

Believe me always, dear Mr. Alger,

Very faithfully yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On the 3d of August Mr. Tayler wrote to him, saying that he hoped to be quite well again in a month or six weeks, but that he had finally made up his mind to relinquish the habitual exercise of the Ministry; and at the same time urging his friend to go to America with "mind free and unembarrassed," and come back in October "richly laden with health, strength, spirits, and noble reputation, to serve the cause of truth and freedom with new power and wider success" in his own country.[1] In a subsequent letter Mr. Tayler announced his intention of removing from Woburn Square to some more rural residence; and not long afterwards he took a house in Hampstead, which at that time was almost surrounded by beautiful country which has since been covered with

[1] Letters, II. p. 156 *sqq.*

houses. A letter of September 3, relating to these events, reveals some of the depths of Mr. Martineau's character; and no one will now be hurt if it shows how sensitive he was to any apparent want of spiritual response, and that he could not always see when souls were penetrated by his words, and hearts were too deeply touched to allow themselves any open expression.

AUCHRANNIE, INVERCLOY, ISLE OF ARRAN.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—Your letter is so rich in important suggestions, that it has furnished constant matter for reflection in my rambles ever since, and often in wakeful hours of the night. All my work with you and under your guidance has been so delightful, your hopeful and gentle spirit has so corrected the eagerness and the despondencies of my more passionate nature, and for the last year and a half I have so deeply felt the privilege of yielding myself to your influence every other Sunday, that you will not wonder if the crisis which makes the first encroachment on our partnership fills me with sad and serious thoughts. It is, however, manifestly necessary, after the recent warning, for you to reduce the strain upon your strength, and by quiet revision of habits and engagements retain an unanxious mastery over the chief field of labour. Little Portland Street must evidently be the first thing to give way: and I cannot but admit, in the midst of my regrets, the wisdom of your decision on this point. The prospect which it opens to me is, in any case, too forlorn to be looked distinctly in the face at present. I have lost none of my interest in preaching; and, with any fair prospect of sufficient genuine spiritual sympathy to sustain one's heart of faith and hope, I would willingly go on while I have strength. But, in spite of its respectable numbers, intelligence, and character, there is something in our congregation, — in the form of service, in the usages and management, in the whole aspect of the people and the place, — which singularly depresses and quenches me, and makes me feel that I am working against the universal stream. To some extent, I know, every preacher, endeavouring to reach convictions and seats of consciousness that lie deep below the common surface of our life, must feel this — in Liverpool I was not free from it — but yet I never could entertain there the doubt that oppresses me in London, whether there is any response whatever to what comes from

the true springs of all preaching. However, I do not mean to prejudge this question, much less to decide it on the impulse of perhaps too ideal a feeling. When I see what is asked of me, the duty will doubtless clear itself before me.

I have been pondering much, and from every side, your amended program of academic work. So far as I am concerned, there is not the slightest obstacle to the adoption of every part of it. I shall most gladly arrange to concentrate my lectures on the alternate days, and to attend prayers not only on those days, but habitually. For, if you carry out your design as to residence, there is surely no reason why you should endanger its advantage and refreshment by so overstrained an arrangement for the morning hours. To leave your house at half-past seven, you must breakfast a quarter before seven, and rise not later than six; and, however feasible this may look in summer, and may actually be to a household full of young vigour, I can hardly think it practicable without hazard in your case through all the dark and cold days of the year. Why not take your lectures from 10 or even 11 o'clock onwards, leaving the previous responsibilities to me? This would secure you daylight and reasonable hours, without dangerous tension, throughout the year. A misgiving also troubles me respecting your night at University Hall once a week. I know by experience what that is; and I fear you would find it very desolate and depressing, and inconsistent with proper rest and sleep. A room *exceptionally inhabited* is never cheerful or even wholesome; the Hall at best cannot fail to present a strong contrast with your noiseless country seclusion; and after the labours and excitement of a working day, you need, instead of a sentence of solitary confinement, the quiet letting down which can only be had from the dear domestic presence and the familiar home. Nor perhaps would you find the students' evening quite the same thing in the *Council-room* that it has been in Woburn Square. It is difficult to shake off the influences of place; and in that large, cold, formal hall I cannot fancy the same free, disengaged, opening out of converse which your own tea-table would encourage. Did I not think that you would prefer having the students to yourself, and that I should rather be in the way if I were present, I should urge you to come to my house, and hold the evening there. I have been considering with my wife how I could see more of the young men in quiet personal intercourse, for I am not at all satisfied with my present imperfect relations with them; and for any hint

or help towards this end I should be truly grateful. If, on your removal from town, a transference of your evening with them from Woburn Square to Gordon Street would answer at once the old purpose and the new, I should be only too happy.

. . . I must not say anything of the *unspeakable* loss incurred by your disappearance from our London social circles; serious as the sacrifice is of one of their choicest personal influences, it must be cheerfully made, if really good for you upon the whole. But I find a difficulty in fancying you without clear scope for your rich and various nature, and especially your openness to sympathy with other minds, than a remote suburban banishment affords. It is only a one-sided and contracted man — and not a person like yourself — that can live always on books and home; and however welcome the tranquillity of such a life after long tossing on the surging tide of London excitement, it might easily, by too great constancy, become flat and depressing to a susceptible spirit."

Mr. Tayler soon afterwards sent in his resignation, and preached his farewell sermon on the 23d of December.

Some further anxiety, during the vacation, was caused by the illness of Mr. Russell Martineau, largely induced by over-fatigue in Switzerland, and on the journey home. A few weeks, however, sufficed to restore his strength and enable him to resume his work.

The literary fruit of this year's labour was chiefly of a philosophical character. The April number of the "National Review" contained an article, the subject of which is sufficiently indicated by its title, "Cerebral Psychology: Bain."[1] In October a profound essay on "Nature and God" appeared in the same magazine.[2] His address at the opening of the Session at Manchester New College in October, "Factors of Spiritual Growth in Modern Society,"[3] is mainly a criticism of Mr. Buckle's

[1] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," and as "Bain's Psychology," in Essays, III.

[2] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," and in Essays, III.

[3] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

thesis that the improvement of mankind is due to intellectual discovery, and an attempt to prove "the irreversible dependence of social civilisation on moral vitality." But before proceeding to this subject he makes touching allusion to the losses of the year, and, among others, refers to the death of Theodore Parker. "How can we forget," he asks, "that sad Florentine grave which has quenched the light of so much nobleness? Or help feeling that, in the loss of Theodore Parker, the nerve of natural piety, the arm of righteous reform, the courage of every generous hope, are enfeebled, not for his world alone, but for ours too?"

In the latter part of 1860, and for about two years subsequently, he was deeply interested in the preparation of a book of liturgical services, which was published, with the title "Common Prayer for Christian Worship," in 1862. This work was undertaken by a body of London ministers, who commissioned one of their members "to revise the Services in use in the Church of England, and to make additions from other sources, after having carried out more fully a course of reading," which had always been his delight. The gentleman referred to, but not named, in these words from the Preface, was the Rev. Dr. Sadler, the minister of Rosslyn Hill Chapel, Hampstead, a man whose shrinking from personal obtrusiveness sometimes prevented an adequate appreciation of his great attainments, but whose saintly character engaged the love of all who knew him, and whose simple presence was a Christian benediction. Dr. Martineau's feelings towards him are expressed in a letter to Mrs. Sadler, written on Sept. 18, 1891, after the sudden death of her husband from disease of the heart: —

"However natural it may be to deplore being deprived of the last living look and the last 'Farewell,' reflection may warrant the belief that no departure can be gentler than one

in which the summons executes itself. For your dear saintly husband no notice, no discipline was needed. All was in order. He had but to go.

"The infrequency of my intercourse with Dr. Sadler during the years of my residence in London would seem, to an ordinary observer, hardly an adequate base for the deep affection which I felt for him. I loved his public services. I was in sympathy with him in his judgments on our ecclesiastical affairs. In the relations between us arising out of the 'Common Prayer for Christian Worship,' I found occasion only for grateful appreciation of his exactitude in management, and perfect accord with all his proposals. There remains to me, among surviving ministerial friends, no one like-minded with him, excepting only my older companion in love and labour, Mr. Thom. His work is crowned. His memory is blest. And he has left you no sorrows but those of patient hope and aspiration. I know of no other record in our churches such as his."

Such was the man with whom a frequent correspondence was to be maintained on the subject of the prayer-book. Mr. Martineau's general views, founded on a criticism of the Church of England Liturgy, are presented in the first extant letter, Nov. 26, 1860: —

"During the last two days I have carefully studied the Liturgical Services so laboriously and skilfully prepared by you and revised by the Sub-committee appointed in the summer. While the impression of them is fresh, I will try to define it, and put it to the test of written statement.

"The more I think of it, the more do I regret the original instructions which confined you to the Church of England type of service. *Within these limits* the work appears to me to have been done in nearly the best possible way; all that nice judgment, true feeling, and a taste tinctured and enriched by familiarity with the best expressions of ecclesiastical devotion, could effect in adapting this form to our wants, has been accomplished; and those who invited you to this difficult and delicate undertaking cannot but feel grateful to you for the admirable execution of it. The few particular expressions which awaken some scruple in me — and to which I will presently refer — admit of easy alteration such as you would

probably deem admissible. But my chief difficulties lie deeper, and go beyond the execution, to the very problem itself. I believe it impossible for us ever, *sincerely and without artificial strain*, to naturalise the Prayer Book model of Worship. It is the product of a theory of Religion radically different from ours; and, in the process of transference to us, it loses its own meaning without becoming the natural vehicle of ours. Admirers of the Church Service are apt to look only at its several component parts, taken one by one, — especially the Collects; and if this were all we had to judge about, I should largely share their feeling. But when from the materials we turn to the *construction and conception of the whole*, it is astonishing to me that we do not at once feel ourselves in a region which is foreign to our own, and whose forms do no justice to the breadth and brightness of our own faith.

"The basis and regulative idea of the Church Service are supplied from a *Sacerdotal* religion. There is an *Altar;* there is a *Priest*. The worship — like the offerings at the Jewish *Temple* — is a *sacrifice*, presented as a required condition of the Divine placability towards us, and in compliance with the terms of a *promise;* and the 'opus operatum' is gone through with the understanding that if we do *our* part, — in the way of humiliation of ourselves and exaltation of God, — we may sufficiently 'please him,' for him to listen to our prayers and perform *his* part. Accordingly, the Service opens with Deprecation and Penitence, — as if the first thing was to make sure of sinking yourself low enough; and not till the Priest has, in virtue of this, pronounced his Absolution, can God be asked to 'open our lips,' that we may 'shew forth *His praise*.' This work (the *Praising* of God) forms the second section of the Service, — by far the finest, had it only more the character of human outpouring than of deliberate laudation according to a system and for an end. Then finally — the two conditions having been complied with, viz. the worshipper sufficiently humbled, the object of worship sufficiently exalted — the series of petitions is presented with hope of a favourable hearing. I think it is impossible to deny that this is the *program* on which the Service is constructed. If so, it is the expression of a devotion fundamentally different from ours.

"For, both by origin and by conviction, the whole genius of our Christianity is of the Protestant and Puritan type; whose worship is not a 'Service' or 'bounden duty' rendered to God, but a free outpouring of affection towards Him in contemplation of our relations towards Him. Hence, the

Order of worship has always been with us, through all the ages of our Non-Conformist existence, the *natural human order* in which the pious affections follow one another as they kindle and deepen in the course of meditation and prayer. By this rule the Penitential part of devotion lies *far on* in the interior recesses of worship; the profound sense of sinful imperfection is not ready on the surface of even the humblest mind; and it is not till the spirit has felt its way through the mists and dimness in which Prayer begins, and emerged into the clear presence of the Infinite Holiness, that the abasing consciousness of spiritual poverty is awakened, and the sad interval is seen between what we are and what we ought to be. All the old Non-Conformist divines — all the usages handed down to us, recognise this natural order. In Henry's 'Method of Prayer,' and every similar book, it is assumed that Worship must make its first steps with tentative reverence and awe, — with a certain solemn caution, like a trustful advance into the dark, pausing to realise the foot-fall of every thought; and it is only when the threshold has been left far behind, and a freer movement of the soul among Divine things has been gained, that the outpourings of repentance are permitted to have way. So with the arrangement of Psalms and Hymns. Who would not be offended with the incongruity if, on opening a hymn-book, he found all the Penitential Hymns at the beginning to be sung at the outset of Public Worship? Such an arrangement is utterly uncongenial with our habitudes of feeling, and has proper place only where *Absolution* is the hinge of the whole worship, and humiliation leads up to it, as Praise (now authorised) succeeds to it. I cannot but fear that, in consequence of this misplacement, a very superficial feeling follows our liturgical confessions; that the words have little real meaning for those who utter them; and that precisely the minds of deepest sincerity and most susceptible piety are the least at home in them. How can it indeed be expected that a whole congregation should in an instant fling itself into an attitude of mind, of which the language of the prodigal son, in the very crisis of his agony, should be the appropriate expression? . . . Surely we none of us believe, and Christ did not mean to teach, that human persons in general, and his disciples everywhere and always, are in the case of the prodigal son. Ought we not, then, to reserve such intensities of language for really analogous cases? Do we not else imitate the orthodox, who support their theory of human corruption from

the passionate utterances of David's compunction on awaking from his sin? In like manner, why should *every one* of the *introductory texts* in the first and second service be *deprecatory and confessional*, with no sentence of reverence, of trust, of joy? The reason is obvious in the Church Service; and the moment *you* escape into free composition (in the third and following services), your selection breaks this narrow boundary; but this only shows that we want a scope which the chosen model does not allow. Grant the Church-idea of the Service, and its principle of selection is right; throw open the range of choice, and the preservation of the Church order (opening with general confession) is wrong. Again, what possible meaning has the *Absolution* in the revised form? It merely repeats — without even a shade of variety — the truth which is the burden of the address just given, and exhorts the people to pray for the repentance which they have just been uttering. In taking out what we cannot retain in it, we remove the very pith and essence of it, and leave it, as it seems to me, an empty husk. The Church of England has already weakened it in this direction, and half disguised the absolving act; but our further reformation dissipates its significance altogether. This is only an instance of the difficulty of touching the structure without impairing its idea. Admirably formed for the consistent expression of a low conception of Christianity, it loses its physiognomy and life when its harshnesses are painted over; yet by no varnishing can be turned into a speaking likeness of the more trustful, disinterested, aspiring and expanded features of modern piety. Of *communion* between the Divine and Human Spirit there is no trace. It is the worm in the dust before the Almighty; the rebel availing himself of opportunities of supplication and mediation; the sinner wishing to be reconciled, for the sake of his Salvation, and perpetually reminding God of His 'promises' in that direction. This taint of servile interest, at times deepening almost into abjectness, is beyond the reach of any verbal revision.

"I believe, therefore, that we make a fundamental mistake in deserting the old line of Nonconformist piety, first opened to us by the sincere movements of free prayer, and in reverting to an essentially sacerdotal type, quite alien to our genius. To a liturgical form in itself you know I have no objection; and all my natural leanings are in the direction of Conformity and Unity, where simplicity and veracity allow. But we have a characteristic testimony to bear, and have no right

to weaken it by making our worship less than the whole and absolute utterance of it."

In deference to the views thus expressed, and in order to "reach more effectually some chords of modern feeling," some of the forms were intrusted to Mr. Martineau for reconstruction. The result was the preparation of two new services, — the Ninth and Tenth in the volume. The manuscript of this was completed and forwarded to Dr. Sadler for his approval on the 31st of July, 1861. Some extracts from a letter of that date will explain "the peculiarities" of his "attempt": —

"1. My first intention, as you will perhaps remember, was simply to recast the materials of two of your services. I soon found, however, that in doing so I should spoil what was admirable in one type without effectually realising the required example of another. To pilfer *more than two* of your services would have been to commit an uncompensated havoc; and still without covering the whole ground of the want I seem to feel. I have ended with, I fear, the too bold attempt to frame the services anew, without tampering at all with what you have so excellently done. There are now two different ideas separately carried out; *both* true to my own feeling in certain aspects; each supplementing the other; and neither, by itself, capable of meeting the whole case of our ecclesiastical wants.

"2. The most startling appearance of innovation is perhaps in the *Canticles*. I meant at first to have inserted certain of the Psalms. But the most suitable were already bespoken in your services. And no mere process of excision of verses seemed to reduce the materials into a satisfactory form; it destroyed one poetical unity without producing another. What is sung before and after the Lessons ought, I think, to be not mere *general* hymns of Praise, but to have distinct reference to the order and progress of Divine Revelation in human history and life. The Hebrew and Christian Scriptures are rich in materials giving embodiment to the fundamental conceptions required; but these are not available without a reproduction which discharges the elements no longer real to us. For this free use of Scripture elements there is good authority in the usage of the early Christian Church (whose

hymns were often a cento of Biblical verses), in that of the English Church in the Canticle alternative with the Te Deum, and in some of your own Services. I have certainly carried the method further than is conformable with our stereotyped practice in modern times; further, indeed, than I originally contemplated. But, apart from mere habit, there seems to be no reason why the prose hymns which we chant should not shape themselves with the same free evolution out of the spirit and materials of Scripture as the rhyme hymns which we sing. Having ventured on this experiment, I have repeated from your services only the *Te Deum*. As I have not your MS. of the first Service, I do not know how far our versions of the Te Deum agree. We should bring them to harmony, however, if both Services are published."

The objections which he felt to some established Christian phrases are perhaps nowhere so fully and clearly expressed as in a letter of August 21: —

"My scruple about the terms 'Mediator,' 'Redeemer,' and 'Saviour,' applied to Christ, has always lingered and hung about my mind from boyhood, though I am ashamed to say I have never till now had the courage and simplicity to look it fairly in the face. And now that I do so, and try the hearts of others on the matter, I find that they too suffer from the same feeling of misleading profession and infirm sincerity in the use of these words which has secretly troubled me all my life. Pure-minded *young* persons in particular, who crave a real and living thought for every expression of faith, and are less affected than we by venerable usage, have repeatedly asked me for a meaning to these words; about which I could never effectually satisfy them. Naturally, I have resorted to just the interpretations which you suggest, and which, I fully admit, provide an intelligible meaning for the phrases and involve no false doctrine. It is, however, indubitably an *invented* meaning, devised in order to save the phrases, — and *not* by any means the sense they hear either in Scripture whence they come, or in the Church which has fixed their permanent significance. 'Mediator,' *e. g.*, means, as you observe, 'instrument for *bringing us to God*.' But by this you and I intend no more than that we owe to Christ our *right apprehension of God; our subjective state* in regard to spiritual things would have been quite other than it is but for the light of his image in our hearts. And this subjective

right relation to God is not, in our case, one which has been superinduced upon a prior alienation, so as to constitute *a change* out of darkness into light. We were born into it, and have all along *been with* God in Christ, and have at no date been '*brought to* him' by Christ; unless the '*we*' is spoken of the human race historically, and not meant to be personally appropriated by the individual worshippers. Now I cannot think that anyone, wanting simply to say that he thinks of God as Christ shows him to be, would ever hit upon such a phrase as that Christ was his '*Mediator.*' 'Mediator' implies an *objective transaction,* removing an *objective alienation,* and establishing an indirect reconciliation between those who previously stood in *no direct relations* but of hostility. And notoriously this is the sense in which Christendom universally preoccupies the word; those who use it in every church but ours feel themselves, in their own persons, born into alienation from God; and then, in baptism or in conversion, transferred from the curse of nature to the grace of God, being credited with the substitutive righteousness of Christ. Suppose them *not baptised, not converted, not invested* with the protection of Christ's work and intercession, and they remain aliens from God, and without hope. In *this* theory the 'Mediation' is an intelligible reality; and the term, appropriated as as it is to this theory, involves a *denial of direct relations* between the soul and God, and an assumption of natural enmity averted by personal interposition of Christ, to which there is nothing in our individual history corresponding, as there *is* in that of every orthodox person.

"Very much the same considerations weigh with me with regard to the other terms. 'Redeemer,' 'Saviour' are words implying in the '*redeemed*' *and* '*saved*' a *transference* from a prior lost or enslaved to a subsequent rescued condition. To most Unitarian Christians no such transference takes place through their discipleship; whatever power their faith gives them over the lower inclinations is an habitual power, present in the earliest formation of their character; and you cannot be 'redeemed' or 'saved' from a state in which you *never were* but only *would have been* under certain imaginable conditions. At least on the same principle I might call David my 'Saviour' in consideration of the deep spiritual obligations under which the Psalms have laid me. Moreover, the words 'Redeemer,' 'Saviour' are words of *Objective Agency,* implying something more than the presence of *an Image or Idea* to the believing and contemplating mind; and to apply them

to Christ merely because the *thought of him* helps our self-dedication, appears to me to take the very life-blood of the phraseology away. And finally, the words are *relative;* and *that from which* there is 'redemption,' 'salvation' is always implied in the meaning; and this, too, both in Scripture and Church usage, is essentially, and must always be understood to be, *objective privation and misery*, the curse of nature or the penalty of guilt, — and not the inner moral and spiritual feebleness, to which your interpretation refers. That we are doomed to perdition by nature, snatched into deliverance by grace, and *that* only by having an interest in the righteousness which Christ *wrought for us;* — this is the false system of relations which the terms in question accurately express and firmly grasp; and to suborn the same phraseology to betray its old contents and become the instrument of an opposite faith appears to me, I must confess, indefensible on the score either of wisdom or of simplicity. *Spoiled* language one may always step in and restore to its original rights. And if by substituting the *Scripture meaning* of these terms for the ecclesiastical one we could reach the thought we desire to express, I should be quite in favour of retaining the words. But though we thus *get out of the orthodox doctrine*, we do not, I fear, *get into our own*, or even much nearer to it. Restoration being impossible, I see nothing for it but rejection.

"With regard to such phrases as 'in the name of Jesus Christ' (even taking it in the sense of 'as disciples,' etc.) I find it difficult to see why we should be anxious to declare *in what particular capacity* we pray. Surely in a Christian congregation the thing speaks for itself; and this formula would never have got stereotyped as the close of prayer but for the notion of pleading in an efficacious name or capacity.[1] So of the other meaning which you assign, and which with you I have assigned, to the remaining phrases, — they seem to me irrelevant to the prayer when you get at them (and this the proper orthodox meanings are *not*), and too far-fetched to occur in the face of the obvious, even obtrusive, significance of the original writer. We are in danger, therefore, of spoiling the theology of others, while winning only an encumbrance for our own. True, one parts with the dear old

[1] In a subsequent letter he says: "I learn from Stanley that the Eastern Church has never resorted to the form of Prayer 'through Jesus Christ.' It is a Western peculiarity." Instead of this form, if I mistake not, a doxology is used. — J. D.

forms, consecrated by so many pious lips, with affectionate regret. But rather with their meanings — their living soul — than with themselves; for I never care to save the verbal shell when the pulse that throbbed in it has gone. The identity perishes with the idea; and the word, if compelled to survive the thought, becomes a semblance only or a monument. In short, the same phraseology cannot do service, it seems to me, in opposite systems and be made, in any natural way, the vehicle of contradictory beliefs. Very slight, scarcely perceptible, alterations suffice, for the most part, to meet this scruple, which custom has hitherto prevented from being obtrusive; but which is likely, if I am not much mistaken, to come into active force in the next generation."

His remarks upon the Te Deum are sufficiently striking for quotation. Apparently some scrupulous Unitarian objected to the clauses, which, as revised, are presented in this form: "The holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge thee, the Father of an infinite Majesty; thy beloved, true, and glorified Son; thy Holy Spirit, also the Comforter." On Nov. 5, 1863, Mr. Martineau writes: —

"I agree unreservedly with Mr. ——'s objection to all *adapted* use, in new or mitigated senses, of orthodox language; and was inclined, as you will remember, to restrain within narrower limits than your first feeling would have required, the ambiguous employment of even Scripture phraseology. But the passage in the Te Deum to which exception is taken is absolutely free, in its original form, as standing in the Church of England service, of all tincture of Trinitarian doctrine; and our alteration is made on other than dogmatic grounds. The doctrine of the Trinity does not consist in owning and enumerating *three objects* of religious faith, — God, the Supreme Father, — the Son of God, — the Spirit of God; for the acknowledgment of these three is the essential characteristic of all Christendom in all ages; — but in making these three, *equal persons of one Godhead.* So far is this from being done in the passage objected to, that it is excluded in the most direct and positive manner; the *Person addressed* being not left doubtful, — so that you might suppose it was the *Trinity*, and then take the three succeeding terms as an

unfolding of the contents, — but being sharply specified and limited by the appositional phrase '*the Father*,' from whom the additional objects of faith are separated by being spoken of in the third person, and to whom they are referred as secondary belongings by the epithet '*Thy*.' That the pronoun '*Thee*' should be taken as a comprehensive term, including (1) its own equal, 'The Father,' (2) 'THY *Son*,' (3) 'THY *Holy Spirit*,' is quite impossible unless by a stranger to the English language."

In his own subsequent revision of 1879, however, he changes the form to the following: "The Father, hid in infinite Light; shown in the mind of thy most beloved Son; felt in thy Holy Spirit, the comforter."

The manuscript of the whole work passed under his eye prior to publication, and he made many careful criticisms and suggestions with a view to its improvement.

In the early part of 1861 he was again anticipating a visit to America; but on the outbreak of the Civil War and the occurrence of uneasy relations between the two countries, he felt that the time was inopportune. His feelings are expressed in a letter to Mr. Alger: —

10 GORDON STREET, LONDON, W. C., June 27, 1861.

MY DEAR MR. ALGER, — It seems a strange thing to say, but, let me confess it, I have been waiting in hope that your letter, just received, would pronounce in favour of my remaining at home this year. For, to say the truth, I have an unconquerable conviction that the present is not the time in which I ought to interpose myself among you. At the time when I last wrote, I still clung to the hope that it would not really come to civil war; and had I foreseen the present posture of affairs, I should have felt the impropriety of taxing the hospitality of my friends in the United States at such a crisis, and should have withdrawn at once, as I now do, my contemplated but, as it proves, unseasonable arrangement for visiting them. In the great struggle which engages you, you ought to be, and doubtless are, absorbed in the duties and anxieties of the hour. No other topic should have any interest for your Convention; — I would not give a fig for your national spirit if it had. Yet on *this* topic no one but an

American has any right to speak to you, and the words of a foreigner would be a profane impertinence. I therefore write to you at once, and shall write to Mr. Hinckley as soon as his letter arrives, to express my deep personal regret that again we are prevented from taking counsel together on our common affairs, human and divine; but to acknowledge the clear necessity of cancelling for the present the engagement with which, in happier circumstances, I was honoured.

Since I last wrote, the course adopted by Great Britain has evidently awakened — quite gratuitously, as we all of us, to a man, think here — a very painful feeling in your Northern States. The intensity of this feeling is attended by the concurrent evidence of all persons returning from the States and all the publications that reach us. I know perfectly well that this would not in the least affect the personal kindness to myself of my Boston brethren and friends. But in travelling through the country it would either restrict or render unpleasant the casual intercourses without which one's bodily presence in a new world is unprofitable. My friend Dr. Radford, who was to be my travelling companion, a most experienced and accomplished wanderer over the world, has taken advice from Professor Rogers (Pennsylvania) and many other American friends, and shrinks from the journey at this crisis. Mr. —— advises me in the same sense; and all my English counsellors, including my wife, are so urgent in the same direction, that I could not get away without being denounced as a rebel against all legitimate authority. So, my dear friend, I must renounce the present hope, and trust that life may yet grant us a better future. The more " serene and enduring " are the interests on which I should come to confer with you, the better will they wait, and the more would they shrink from the heat and pressure of this great and agitating crisis.

Thank you most heartily for the beautiful photograph of Dr. Hedge, the clear expression of a noble mind. In two days I go, for some weeks to come, to a Scottish home.

With warmest regards,

Ever faithfully yours,

James Martineau.

He also declined an invitation to lecture at a later time in Edinburgh, owing to the pressure of his engagements.

On the 29th of April he presided over the Annual Meet-

ing of the London Domestic Mission. In his address from the chair, having alluded to the sins and miseries of the great city, he spoke of the special function of the Domestic Mission in resisting these evils. It "rested upon the faith that in our humanity there were principles and powers that were for ever raising up a strenuous resistance to the pressure of temptation and the source of degradation; that God does not leave his spiritual offspring without his aid; that even in the darkest recesses of misery there was still open a way for his spirit, which could find a passage through all the bars of the dungeon, like the starlight into the deepest alleys of our cities; that there was no place where the spirit of God could not go, and no human heart which had not a susceptibility for recognising it." He then referred to the foundation of the Mission, and to the fact, already recorded, that he had himself been pressed to accept the office of minister to the poor in London. He had, he said, "weighed the proposal most seriously and long. It appeared to him to be the noblest work which could be offered to any human being to undertake. And if he knew himself, the reason why he declined it was, not any motive of ambition, not any inner, sincere, cordial preference for another course of life, but a consciousness of inner defect for a work that required such a peculiar combination of powers, the consciousness, especially, of what he would call 'religious reticence'; the difficulty of bringing out the inner convictions and inner affections before the face of mankind. It appeared to him that a combination of gifts was requisite for the successful performance of this office, which he knew himself too well to persuade himself that he could possess. . . . He could not help thinking that considerations of the kind to which he now referred were fairly capable of being presented in answer to the taunt that we send forth missionaries to do the work which we ought to do ourselves.

Undoubtedly there was some truth in this reproach; at the same time there was also some extravagance. Frequently we did these things by deputy, not because we were indifferent to them, but because we prize them so highly, reverence them so deeply, that we mistrust our power to do them ourselves, and we accordingly look out for men who have the special aptitudes and gifts for accomplishing a work which ordinary people, with defective tact, with defective judgment, with defective speech, with inward reserve, were unable to do efficiently for themselves." [1]

The summer was spent in the neighbourhood of Gairloch, in Ross-shire. A description of his surroundings is given in a letter to Mr. Tayler: —

AUGUST 23, 1861.

MY DEAR FRIEND, — I heartily congratulate you both on your satisfactory settlement at Hampstead and at your early prospect of escape from it. A removal, though it be only from town to suburb, can never be less than a crisis in a studious man's life. Now that the disagreeable part of the process is happily over, a few weeks within hearing of the sea and sight of the blue hills will bring you back, I trust, only to the repose and hope of a fresh future. We have sometimes been half tempted to say that you prisoners in town have for once the advantage over us; so extraordinary has been the continuance of wet and the frequency of violent storms from the West. Since the first ten or twelve days we have never been more than a few hours without rain, — sometimes driven on the blast like a sheet of water almost horizontal through the air, and sometimes drizzling for twenty-four hours together in a dead calm. No such season is remembered here; and to the peasantry of the country, miserably poor at best, the prospect is serious, for the crops will in great measure, I fear, perish ungathered. At times, the too constant confinement to indoor occupation, without the variety and social stimulus of life in town, I have found a little depressing; and, for want of my usual elasticity, my vacation work has not prospered as I hoped, though in health

[1] From the report in the "Unitarian Herald" for May 4.

I seem to have been unusually well. Half a day's sunshine, however, or even cessation of the sound of wind and wet, gives one a new spring again; and if September sheds a little more genial light on the world without, the world within will soon respond, and carry back a full store of hope and refreshment for the next year. The weather is our only disappointment here. The country, both on the deeply indented coast-line, guarded in the distance by the bold heights of Skye and Lewis, and in the mountain solitudes of the interior, reached through forest vallies and interspersed with innumerable lochs, is wonderfully grand; and the Flowerdale Valley in this immediate neighbourhood . . . is rich in the features of a softer beauty. Further north, about the Lochs Broom, whither I took my wife and Basil an excursion, the towering masses of rock and mountain, frowning right down upon the blue or black inlets of sea below, and making vast forests look like a mere belt of the valley, are of marvellous majesty even in the sunshine, and absolutely awful under the shadow of the clouds. Our house here is separated only by the garden's length from the sea,—a rock-bound minor inlet of the loch. It has no road to it, being built for approach only by water; but a few minutes' walk on the beach brings us to the several roads, and the only other decent houses (the Inn and the Post Office) of the place. As usual, in Scotland, the Free Church rears its ugly head within sight of the uglier Established Church, and draws into it the whole population, with the exception of the Post-master, the shop-keeper, and Lord St. John's family and dependents. It seems impossible that such a state of things can continue; the parish clergyman himself, a liberal man, with whom and whose father-in-law, Professor ——, we have become very friendly, confesses that his Church throughout Scotland has lost all hold of the people, and must either fall or come to some understanding with its successful rival. It seems to me a deplorable necessity; for the parochial clergy, long in contact with the more educated laity and insensibly affected by the more catholic spirit of the age, are the only leaven that at all soften the harshness of the Scottish Calvinism. Nothing more hideous in form, blind in intelligence, and hateful in spirit, than the Free Church religion, as administered among the Gaelic population, is to be found, I apprehend, in Europe, short of Naples and Sicily. Buckle, read upon the spot, scarcely seems to exaggerate. The peculiarity of the popular Protestantism here is, that it seems to have done nothing towards

elevating the habits and temporal well-being of the peasantry. The bog on the mountain side is dotted over here and there with low piles of loose stones, crowned with a black turf gable or arch, through which, with or without hole, oozes a cloud of turf smoke, sometimes, by way of unusual refinement, opening from a herring-barrel as chimney. These kennels, with pools of animal filth lying in the mud which forms the floor, and trickling out of the doorway and turning the whole approach into a fetid sponge, — these are the places where the people live; and such are the prevalent habits of sloth and apathy, too generally united with drunkenness, that there seems no pressure towards anything better. I have never, even in Ireland, seen anything worse than the "bothies" which here break out like a black eruption upon the moor and bog. And I do not believe that in any Protestant country a parallel is to be found. But I must not chatter on in this way about things around me.

The house was not altogether suited to English habits, and is humorously described in a letter to Dr. William Smith of Edinburgh: "Our accommodations in this house are not superlative; but we shall adapt ourselves very well to travellers' necessities. The people are worthy people, but more godly than cleanly; and it will take a good deal of soap to undo the too constant anointing of everything with the oil of piety and neglect."

His literary efforts on behalf of the public were now a good deal curtailed by the pressing duties of his professorship and his ministry. Though it was understood that the congregation was not to expect much pastoral supervision, he could not be content with half measures. He adopted his old plan of giving elaborate courses of religious instruction, and took the deepest interest in the establishment of elementary Day and Sunday Schools, which, under his wise and stimulating guidance, seconded by many devoted workers, reached the highest degree of efficiency. For many years he himself superintended the Sunday School in the afternoon, and the influence of his spirit was seen in the earnestness of the teachers and the

order and good conduct of the classes. With a view to giving the religious influences of the place a still wider range, he established a Sunday evening service, which was conducted by volunteers, including students of the College, who were always encouraged to take their share in such philanthropic exercises.

But amid his multifarious engagements he still found time to enrich the "National Review" with an occasional article. To the April number, 1861, he contributed an essay, chiefly expository, on "Plato, his Physics and Metaphysics." [1] In the following October he had a kindly notice of "Tracts for Priests and People," [2] which were issued by F. D. Maurice and some of his associates, in consequence of the excitement produced by "Essays and Reviews." After noticing the way in which "Danger to the Church" seemed at once "to awaken every dormant ecclesiastical egotism, to widen every difference, to intensify all dogmatism, and hoot down the catholic and charitable temper," he speaks of the Tracts as forming "a marked exception" to the prevalent partizanship, and as being "a serious, manly, and large-hearted exposition of Christian faith, in its direct relations to human life." He complains, however, that there is an absence of reasonable discussion, and, with two exceptions, they are mere personal confessions of faith, which afford not the slightest help to anyone in doubt. His own view of the Incarnation is thus stated: "The Incarnation is true, not of Christ exclusively, but of Man universally, and God everlastingly. He bends into the human, to dwell there; and humanity is the susceptible organ of the divine. And the spiritual light in us which forms our higher life is 'of one substance' (ὁμοούσιον) with his own Righteousness, — its manifestation, with unaltered essence and authority, on

[1] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological" (2d series).
[2] Reprinted in Essays, II.

the theatre of our nature. . . . Of this grand and universal truth Christ became the revealer, not by being an exceptional personage (who could be a rule for nothing), but by being a signal instance of it so intense and impressive as to set fire to every veil that would longer hide it." He finds the real significance of the publication and diffusion of the "Essays and Reviews" in this: "That the intellectual part of Anglican Society is in revolt against the received form of Christianity, and snatching at the hope of something truer and deeper. . . . To the ripest mind and character of this age the creeds speak a foreign language and reach no home within. . . . The whole theory of life — silently felt rather than deliberately thought — has irrevocably changed; consecrating this world, disenchanting the other of a thousand terrors; softening every curse, deepening every trust; blending the colours of nature and of grace; and finding the mysteries of eternity already present at every hour of time."

In 1862 Dr. Sadler, of Hampstead, had the pleasure of removing, with his congregation, to a new and beautiful chapel, erected on a plot of ground adjoining the old brick building where worship had hitherto been conducted. He invited Mr. Martineau to preach the dedicatory sermon. The latter, writing on the 1st of March, declined. He said: "After viewing the matter on every side, I have settled into a clear conviction that I should be occupying a place in which no one ought to stand on that day but yourself, — and least of all one whose misfortune it is to be the object of too mixed a feeling for an occasion demanding pure and perfect sympathy." However, his scruples were overcome, and on March 12 he wrote: "I surrender conditionally. If you won't let the right person preach, you may depend on my being the wrong one." Few that listened to the sermon preached on Thursday, June 5, can have thought he was the wrong one. Founded

on John xvii. 20 and 21, it must rank among his deepest and most beautiful utterances.[1] The keynote of the discourse is struck in the following words: "The union of the Divine and the Human in Christ, while unique in its perfection, is no lonely prerogative of his individual person, but belongs to him as the ideal and representative of humanity; and, were it not a possibility and law for all our souls, its manifestation in him would be a barren wonder without significance. . . . In this view, then, the blending of the Divine and Human in Christ reveals a similar blending of the two in the constitution of our humanity. In the consciousness of this consists discipleship to him. And the life of *Communion* with the Divine Guide abiding in us, — of personal affection towards himself and trust in the leadings of his thought; — of recognition, eye to eye; — of surrender, Will to Will, — this first, this last, this throughout all, is the characteristic of the Christian mind." In opposition to Paganism, which is Nature-worship, Christianity is Spirit-worship. "Once humble and genial to a spirit higher than our own, we shall find ourselves in an invisible communion, drawing us with sweet and mystic ties away from anger, care, and sorrow, and making us one with each other, with Christ, with God."

At this time his own congregation was intending to build; but for some reason the plan was not taken up with sufficient enthusiasm, and was never carried out.

The summer was again spent in the west of Scotland, at Little Loch Broom, near Ullapool, by Dingwall; this time in a more eligible house. Some extracts from a letter to Mr. Tayler, of August 24, will bring the scene, and the life amid its solitudes, before us: —

My dear Friend, — It will be a shameful comment on my idleness and ingratitude if I let you slip away to Dresden

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV., with the title "Worship in the Spirit."

without an answer to your delightful letter, received three weeks ago. The solitary life of a Scotch glen ought to stimulate one's eagerness for converse with distant friends, and, in truth, our passionate thirst for the Post-days shows that it does so; yet somehow the monotonous tenor of the hours, while favouring continuous study, removes the natural breaks at which the more vivacious impulses assert themselves. I am not sure that we do well to remove ourselves so completely from the human world in the vacation; and sometimes I think that your plan is perhaps the wiser, in providing some admixture of congenial society with adequate reserved opportunities of retirement and study. This place is at once the most sequestered, and the grandest in its natural features, that we have ever found for our summer weeks, — a deep and wide valley, up which the sea winds between rocky masses two thousand feet high for some seven miles (forming the Little Loch Broom); and which, a mile or two higher up, becomes a bright grassy bottom, raised as a terrace above a dashing river, and belted round and interspersed with finely grown trees. . . . On the left hand the plain is shut in, at not a furlong's distance, by stupendous steeps, clothed with wood wherever a root can strike; on the right, by a range of mountains about the height of Snowdon, and so precipitous and jagged as to be in parts quite inaccessible. The contrast is most striking between these solemn and almost awful heights, and the living green and sparkling waters of the field around us, and the rich foliage of its stately trees. . . . For a while, in consequence of the Laird's imperfect preparations for our reception, we had a pretty sharp "struggle for existence." For want of boats to meet us on our arrival, we were put out of the steamer with all our luggage on the rocks, four or five miles from our destination, where we had to wait till our signals brought us help. The house had neither fuel nor stores; the two servants, finding themselves helpless, ran off without five minutes' warning, and for some days we had to drag in wood from the plantations and cut it up with our own hands, and forage and cook and clean-up by family division of labour. By degrees, however, resources came in; the missing coal ship arrived; better servants were found; the Postman brought us our weekly bread, and the shepherd our half-sheep; and now we live like Highland lairds. The course of our life is even and quiet enough, varied only by the frowning or the tempting skies; the morning spent in study, while the girls are at their sketching or their books or house-

hold work: the evening in reading aloud: while a walk is got in at some time between. Now and then, when the mountain-heads show clear against the morning sky, I yield to the young folks' entreaty, pack up my mountain barometer, and start with them for a day's climb to the summit. In the panorama from a Scottish height there is a peculiarity of colouring which to my eye gives it a charm quite unique; a purple in the shadows, and a soft aerial gold in the lights, and tender shifting tints upon the sea, which sunnier climates cannot show. . . . Certainly, it is a great thing to see a people so thoroughly reached and penetrated as the Scotch by religious agencies; and no doubt it is mainly to this power that they owe their escape from utter barbarism into a consciousness of Divine relations. But John Knox, I am persuaded, will do no more for this people, or even long hold them where they are; the next stage of their advance waits for some nobler and more genial impulse. When I see what the real stereotyped Presbyterianism is, I thank God for the historical discipline which purified our English ancestral churches, and through the sacrifices commemorated this day opened for the future a more catholic spirit and a more progressive life.

The October number of the "National Review" contained another of his philosophical articles, — "Science, Nescience, and Faith," — which was mainly a criticism of Mr. Herbert Spencer's "First Principles."[1]

His address this year, at the opening of the College session, was on "The Transient and the Permanent in Theology."[2] In this he distinguishes between the immediate apprehension of God through the exercise of our faculties and the mediate knowledge of him derived from nature and from history, and shows that the latter is mixed up with intellectual judgments which are always open to revision. From these the leading conceptions of the Christian faith ought to disengage themselves, for they are moral and personal, not cosmical, and arise out of the *direct* relation of the human spirit to the Divine. Speak-

[1] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," and in Essays, III.
[2] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

ing of the revelation of God in human history he says: "Clear traces of himself he has doubtless impressed on the individual soul. But individuality itself is not formed except in society and by long inheritance of time; it is the last product of rich and various culture, and the philosopher or worshipper of to-day is an epitome of all the ages." Hence arises the need of wide and sympathetic study of biography, history, and language. "Antipathy understands nothing; and not till the theologian looks on Christendom as the last stage in the providential evolution and inspiration of humanity, related to all that goes before, will he apprehend either what lies within or what lies beyond his own faith."

The next two years are marked by few incidents; but his pen was not idle. He wrote, for the "National Review," April, 1863, and April, 1864, two essays on the "Early History of Messianic Ideas."[1] These are chiefly expository, and give an account of the Book of Daniel, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Book of Enoch, which, after all that has been written since, may still be recommended to those who are attracted by brilliant criticism, and desire to see a vivid picture of Jewish Apocalypse. In this discussion he is unable, with Hilgenfeld, to dismiss the Messianic section of Enoch as a Christian addition, and admits the hypothesis of interpolation only in the case of very special phrases. The question is not discussed at any length; but the opinion must be regarded as deliberate, since it differs from that which he expressed shortly before, in the "National" for October, 1863, in his review of "M. Renan's Life of Jesus."[1] He there, without contesting the point, says that this section "is exposed to reasonable suspicion of being a Christian addition to the original production, as late as the closing decades of the first century." This review does full justice to Re-

[1] Reprinted in Essays, III.

nan's "brilliant and impressive volume," while bringing weighty arguments against some of its combinations, and especially defending the character of Jesus from the charge of gradual deterioration. A few indications of the present state of his own opinions may be noticed. Of the miracles in the Gospels he says: "Even those who do not absolutely recoil from the miraculous element in the narrative must feel that it often assumes its form from untenable and obsolete beliefs, and needs to be either dropped as legendary, or corrected into intelligible history." He relies, without hesitation, on the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, and on the facts of the Quartodeciman controversy, as conclusive against the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel. While still refraining from a decided expression of opinion, he says, "it may be reasonably doubted whether we should ever find Jesus directly identifying himself with the Messiah whom he preached; and should not rather see that his definite investiture with that character was the later work of disciples." In this connection he discusses the meaning of the phrase "Son of Man," which, he conceives, Jesus took "rather in avoidance than in assertion of Messianic claims." A noble passage must be quoted in full, as revealing his unclouded love of truth, though perhaps overlooking the danger that, in minds less powerful and less informed than his own, a rash and hasty criticism may sometimes destroy convictions which a true criticism finds it difficult to restore: —

"No doubt it is a tender reverence which clings to each long-consecrated Scripture; but the piety which dominates evidence, and must have it so, is less noble than the piety which submits to it and lives with it as it is. When, in discussing such a question as the origin of the Fourth Gospel, a theologian becomes pathetic about 'robbing the Christian of his treasure,' and drops into commonplaces about 'destructive criticism,' we see at once, beneath that saintly per-

turbation, the inner heart of unbelief, the absence of repose upon realities, the secret purpose to remain within some nimbus of coloured dreams. Cleared vision can 'rob' us of nothing, except as daylight 'robs' the night of ghosts. 'Criticism' can 'destroy' nothing but illusions; the disappearance of which either restores the substituted truth, or at least leaves its place duly 'swept and garnished' for its return. Criticism can 'construct' nothing but hypotheses; which are not divine facts, but mere human representations, and at best can only fill the chasms of knowledge with ideal shadows of probability. The reproach of 'negative,' the boast of 'positive' theology, are alike intrusions, under disguise, of personal desires on the very field consecrated to self-sacrifice. Nothing is 'positive' or 'negative' except in relation to *our preconceptions,* according as they are affirmed or contradicted; and to use such words as tests of merit and expressions of what 'we need,' is tacitly to stipulate with the nature of things to let our dreams alone. This is the very idol-worship and pride of intellect; and we have yet to learn our first lesson in the religion of thought till we feel that it is not ours to choose where the light shall fall or how much of it there shall be; still less to play tricks with it, and fling its images hither and thither with the mirrors and lenses of our own desires; but to watch it as the dawn, and let it steal in where it will, and show the solid forms of things, though it turn the dark hollow into a nest of beauty, and melt our visionary mountains into clouds."

This summer he did not seek such remote solitudes as on some previous occasions. Penmaenmawr was at that time less covered with buildings than it has since become; but there was a sufficient number of lodgings to remove the impression of loneliness; and not far off was Pendyffryn, the beautiful residence of his old friend Mr. S. D. Darbishire. Here, in the neighbourhood of sea and mountain, he spent the vacation, occupying Ty-mawr, a house prettily situated in its own grounds. In a letter to Mr. Tayler, of September 4, he refers to Bishop Colenso, whose work on the Pentateuch was creating so much excitement: —

"He [his son Russell] arrived here just in time to spend a last evening with Bishop Colenso, who much wanted to see him on certain Hebrew matters. The Bishop and his family were upwards of a fortnight at Pendyffryn, and we saw a good deal of them. He preached one Sunday in the drawing-room at Pendyffryn; a sermon of pure and simple natural faith, deepened with the characteristic Christian tone, on the first clause of the Lord's Prayer. It was quite extempore. If I mistake not, there are times when he has misgivings as to the possibility of holding his ecclesiastical ground, and when some alternative design — of which, on mere conjecture, I hardly ought to write — engages his thoughts. But he will not surrender, unless compelled; and he confidently expects a favourable effect from the anticipated verdict of the Judicial Committee in favour of Wilson and Williams. I think it is a pity that he commits himself in his books to so much speculative and precarious criticism. His analysis of the Psalms and argument from them struck me as forced and weak; and I find Russell is painfully impressed with its untenable character, though in most respects satisfied with his volumes. Your suspicion of an emergence of the later Jehovistic worship from a far grosser prior stage is very important, and carries a strong internal evidence of probability. I often think with wonder of the new lights that seem to be everywhere breaking from the oldest records of mankind, by little else than the purification of the eye that scrutinises them; and am grateful for the testimony it gives to the power of inward clearness and simplicity, even when dealing with scanty materials."

On Thursday, December 31, he spoke once more in his former church in Liverpool, giving a "charge to minister and congregation," on the occasion of the Rev. A. Gordon's settlement as a pastor.[1] This charge is full of spiritual beauty, setting forth his idea of the ministry, and asking for a due response from the congregation. One sentence may be quoted, indicating his view of the relation in which Christ stands to the religious life of man, and so giving us a glimpse of his own inward experience: "Christ first becomes a Revelation to us, 'the

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

power of God and the wisdom of God,' when he is preached, not in his solitary individuality, but as standing for our humanity for ever; taking the veil away that hid the Holy Presence there, interpreting for us the double nature of the Self that is ours and the Spirit that is His, and finding the way of reconciliation by surrender of will and utter sacrifice."

In 1864 he contributed to the "National Review" an article on "The Crisis of Faith."[1] This is a review of M. Guizot's "Meditations on the Essence of Christianity"; Strauss's "Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet"; and Dr. Newman's "Apologia." After pointing out the uneasiness observable in all schools of thought, he devotes his chief attention to an examination of Guizot; but we need not dwell on this, as we are already familiar with the line of thought which he adopts. The reader will be more interested by an extract from a letter to Mr. Tayler, written, on the 12th of August, from Kilgobbin, County Dublin, where the vacation was spent: —

"The last number of the 'Theological' fills me with new admiration of your energy as a reader and writer. How you could manage to master and to criticise Strauss's book at the end of the Session I cannot imagine. I have been reading it (only, it is true, at odd times) ever since we came here, and have not yet got through it. I was not prepared for such large allowance of an historical groundwork to the Gospel narrative; still less, for so fine an appreciation of the essential characteristics of the teaching and spirit of Jesus. His chapters, exhibiting this positive side of his critique, are to me exceedingly impressive; and incline me to forgive the ingenuity with which, in the subsequent book, he overworks his mythical solutions. Zeller — as you truly say — has the same fault; yet, take it all in all, his 'Apostelgeschichte' appears to me one of the most masterly productions of the modern historical school. For my part, I cannot but own that, limit as we may and must the extent of these critics' conclusions, they have struck into the right path, and have

[1] Reprinted in Essays, II.

done more than seemed possible before, to reconstruct the conditions of the earliest Christianity. How, consistently with full disclosure of these conditions, to save, for the struggling mass of men, the true power of the religion, is a problem, which, I suppose, must remain a perplexity to this age, and find solution through the fidelity of our successors. I am sorry to see that Guizot in his 'Meditations' takes refuge in mere reactionary blindness, — a blindness venial enough in an old man's private faith, but disqualifying him for public resistance to a movement which he cannot appreciate. With a French layman's lax conception of Christian dogma, and an English Dissenter's uncritical notion of the Bible, he dresses up an amiable but feeble protest, which neither orthodoxy nor learning can accept. Doubtless it is the Atheism of the Positive school, and the Pantheism of Renan, which, confounded in his mind with the freer historical criticism, drives him into undiscriminating reaction."

The position of the "National Review" had for some time been precarious, and the April number, in 1864, brought it to a close. In November a "New Series" began; but the public response was not sufficient to justify the promoters in continuing their efforts. In March of the same year the first number of a new journal, "The Theological Review," was published under the able editorship of the Rev. Charles Beard. It was believed that this would not interfere with the "National"; for it was more limited in scope, and, though it was conducted on broad lines, and was not confined to Unitarian contributors, it was understood to be in a loose sense a denominational organ. Mr. Martineau regarded it with approval, though he felt unable to be one of its regular staff.

On the 10th of November, 1864, he preached a sermon at the opening of Oakfield Road Church, Clifton, entitled "The God of the Living."[1] The theme of the sermon is the presence of the "life of God in the soul of man and in the courses of the world." An historical revelation "is not a revelation of which we have a finished his-

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

tory; but a revelation of God through human history; therefore with foci, it may be, of intensest light, but with curve wide as the sweep and continuous as the lines of our humanity." Hence Revelation, as the "unfolding of God's living personality where it was undiscerned before," is inevitably "progressive and indefinitely open." Christ is, indeed, a real person, whose spirit and characteristic words are known facts; but men's power of apprehension is not the same, and, "ever since the Advent, the divine image of the Son of God has been going its round through the chambers of our sleeping humanity; flashing on the eyelids ready to be lifted at its approach, and mingling with the dreams of those whose hour was not yet come"; so that "the full significance of God's revelation in him is found in the consciousness not of the first age, but of the last." These thoughts are unfolded with his usual wealth of language and illustration.

In November, 1865, the pages of the "Theological Review" were enriched by the address which he had delivered at the opening of the Session at Manchester New College, on the 9th of October. The subject was kindred to that which he had selected three years before, — "Theology in Relation to Progressive Knowledge." [1] Having shown that theology, if it is capable of being taught, must have something real and permanent for the intellect to hold by, and also undetermined and progressive lines on which the teacher must move, and having criticised the prevailing mode of dividing the constant from the variable elements, he thus stated the principle which was observed in the College: "The things *about which we teach* are given in perpetuity; but the things *to be taught about them* are open to revision in every age." This enlargement of the variables in theology, so as to include the whole sphere of phenomenal knowledge, cannot put any

[1] Reprinted in "Essays Philosophical and Theological," and in Essays, IV.

real Revelation at hazard; for all revelation must be a disclosure of *things as they are;* and scientific evidence can only bring us closer to reality. "If Christendom, sickly and feeble with its long disease of dogma, has come to put its trust, not so much in the living God and his own real ways, as in certain opinions about him and reports of his acts, it is a healing process to disengage its soul from the detaining veil of human notions and propositions, and deliver it straight into personal divine relations." One of the examples of altered thought may be quoted: "If from the person of Jesus Christ the artificial dress of Messianic investiture and some disguising shreds of Jewish fable drop away, who that can fix an appreciating eye on the emerging form will not say that it is diviner far, embodying in its grand and touching lineaments the essence and spirit of a new life of God in our humanity?"

The cessation of the "National Review" was followed by a marked change in Mr. Martineau's literary habits, and the years are no longer crowded with his searching criticisms and suggestive essays. The great event of the year 1866 was an incident connected with University College, in which, for once, orthodoxy and heresy kissed one another in the friendship of a common bigotry. There was much warmth of feeling on both sides of the controversy at the time; but Mr. Martineau, while thinking the action of the College wrong in principle, preserved his own equable temper, and restrained the zeal of some of his combative supporters. The narrative may be related in his own calm words, from the "Biographical Memoranda," supplemented by a few further dates and facts:—

"On the occurrence, in 1866, of a vacancy in the University College Professorship of the Philosophy of Mind and Logic, through the retirement of the Rev. Dr. Hoppus, I became a candidate for the Chair [having first obtained the

sanction of the Committee of Manchester New College, in reply to a letter written on the 1st of July]. At the age of sixty-one this was a step not to be taken without careful consideration; and so reasonable appeared to me a preference for some younger man that I should have felt it no grievance had my application been at once set aside on this ground. On the other hand, I was habitually teaching the subjects required within stone's throw of University College, many students of which resorted to my classes and did well in their University examinations; and, whilst thus a certain store of materials and experience was ready, I was conscious of not being sleepy in my methods, but on the watch to simplify or enrich them with every obtainable improvement. Against the disadvantages of age there seemed therefore a sufficient set-off in my position to justify the offer of my services.

"My previous work having been so much within sight of University College, I sought no testimony of competency except from two or three eminent 'experts' in the subjects of the Chair, who could speak with some authority on technical matters not likely to be familiar to the electing body. I was aware from correspondence or personal intercourse, that F. W. Newman, J. S. Mill, and Dr. Thomson, Archbishop of York, had knowledge of such occasional writings as I had put forth on logical and metaphysical topics; and I asked them whether they would object to record their judgment of these, so far as they indicated fitness or unfitness to teach. Mr. Newman's answer was immediate, cordial, and exact. Mr. Mill was even more appreciative, and said what could hardly fail to be decisive, if produced in evidence; but he added that, as he could not miss the opportunity of planting, if possible, a disciple of his own school in a place of influence, he must throw his weight into the scale of Mr. Croom Robertson's candidature, of whose competency he was well satisfied. His attestation, therefore, privately so generous to me, must be withheld from use. The Archbishop of York sent me a reply, twelve months after the affair was all over, apologising for his silence, and candidly explaining it as the result of a theological scruple; for, if he had said what he thought true of my personal qualifications for the vacant office, he would have been helping to a place of influence one who did not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. In this spectacle, of Mr. Mill and the Archbishop moving hand in hand, under the common guidance of a sectarian motive, there is a curious irony.

"In aid of its judgment in making new teaching appointments, the Council of University College consults the Senate of Professors, from which a report is received after examination of the candidates' apparent merits. [All applications were to be sent in by the 16th of July; and the Senate was to report its recommendation to a meeting of the Council on the 4th of August, when the election was to be made.] The Senate having reported in my favour, it was supposed that the matter was practically settled. But at the Council-meeting, Mr. Grote, whose official and personal influence was naturally powerful, strongly resisted the usual action on the Report, and by his casting-vote[1] negatived the Resolution for my appointment. His objection was, that, as a minister of religion, I was disqualified for the Chair; and, if I remember right, he endeavoured (unsuccessfully) to carry a General Resolution, declaring that such appointments should be reserved for secular persons only. It was obvious to reply that, applications for the Chair having been invited without any such limitation, it could not now be *avowed* as a ground of exclusion; that the retiring Professor himself had been a minister of religion; and that, through the whole history of the College (as now), clergymen, Jewish preachers, and Nonconformist ministers had been eligible, and elected for its several Chairs. The very principle indeed which the College was founded to represent was that of non-exclusion, — of scholars or of teachers, — on religious grounds, and the equal eligibility of all competent persons, irrespectively of their relations to theology, for its responsible offices. [Mr. Grote's resolution was 'that the Council consider it inconsistent with the complete religious neutrality proclaimed and adopted by University College to appoint to the Chair of the Philosophy of Mind and Logic a candidate eminent as minister and preacher of any one among the various sects dividing the religious world.' This resolution was lost by a majority of one. On the motion that Mr. Martineau be appointed the votes were equal, and the Chairman, Lord Belper, gave his casting-vote against it.]

"The effect of the casting-vote was purely negative. No one was elected: no one was rejected: the proposed choice had simply not taken place. The Council accordingly began *de novo,* and advertised the vacancy over again as if for fresh applications, to be in their turn submitted to the judgment of the Senate. Of this advertisement I knew nothing; and

[1] This is an error, as Lord Belper was in the Chair.

my application, having received no answer, remained as it was. Mr. Robertson, I believe, re-applied; but no fresh candidates appeared. As the Senate therefore had no new materials before it, there was little chance of drawing from it any altered judgment. An attempt, however, was made to show that the candidates, though not more than before, were fewer; for my application, not having been renewed, might be treated as withdrawn. As it was still, with its supporting documents, in the Secretary's hands, it could not be set aside without communication with me. But I might, perhaps, be brought to say, that I was not an applicant this second time; and then the act of dropping my candidature would be my own, and nothing would stand in the way of the desired result. I was accordingly pressed to declare whether I had repeated my application; and had only to answer that, having heard nothing of my original application, no occasion for a second had arisen. The question before the Senate, being thus identical with the former one, could only be answered in the same way; but the effect of the answer might, perhaps, be neutralised by attaching a word of doubt whether it would be expedient to appoint a minister of religion, and adding that, if there was weight in this doubt, the Junior candidate presented satisfactory evidence of competency. I believe I am correct in saying that in this form the Senate's Report came before the Council [which met on the 3d of November, and once more rejected the motion for Mr. Martineau's election]. The awkwardness of a collision between 'the two houses' being thus removed, the election of Mr. Robertson was secured by a coalition between those who objected to *any* minister of religion and those who objected to an *unorthodox* minister. There was the more room for the play of these objections, because my competitor had every merit that could be proved of an untried man, and gave no uncertain promise of these high qualifications for the functions of a teacher and an independent thinker which he has since evinced.

"To the story which seemed here to close, there was still an appendix. Though the appointment to the Chair was legitimate and complete and there was no desire to disturb it, many of the College Governors saw, in the reasons which had avowedly determined it and which Mr. Grote had sought to erect into a rule recorded on the Minutes, a violation of the fundamental principle of their Institution; and called, by requisition, a Special General Meeting of Proprietors to re-

view the proceedings of the Council. [The requisition was signed by fourteen Fellows of the College and six other Proprietors. Mr. Robertson had not in fact been yet appointed, though Mr. Martineau's candidature had been definitely rejected. The Council met on the 8th of December, and, in deference to some legal difficulties which were raised, referred the requisition to the law officers; and then rendered any possible meeting of the Proprietors nugatory by proceeding to the appointment of Mr. Robertson.[1]] The policy of this measure did little justice to its excellent intention. An abstract constitutional principle is put to too severe a strain when its assertion, besides being retrospective and condemnatory, is matched against a crowd of inconvenient practical consequences. Any resolution which could satisfy the Requisitionists would have been regarded as a vote of censure by the Council, and been followed by their resignation; and their retirement could not but affect the stability of the appointment, in making which they had incurred unfavourable comment. Nor would any successors to them be readily found, under the liability to have their action called in question, not simply at their Annual rendering of their account, but at Special Meetings convened to arraign it. These considerations were sufficient to incline the majority — now that the affair was over — 'quieta non movere'; even apart from the predominant influence of Mr. Grote and the school with whom any admission of Religion is a disqualification for Philosophy. The proceedings of the Council were consequently upheld.

"The College which, in these transactions, gained one admirable Professor, lost another. Professor Augustus De Morgan, who by his matchless teaching had wrought the marvel of making Mathematics popular, and by his original researches had variously advanced as well as simplified their methods, had been originally drawn to the College by the attraction of its non-exclusive constitution, and, from hearty allegiance to this, had given to it the industry of a life and the lustre of a brilliant reputation. With his simple and direct moral vision he saw at once that all he cared for in the College was at stake in the question which this election raised. Just and liberal to his inmost heart, and logical in his whole thought, he despised negative and positive intolerance alike, and could never admit that the one was 'broad'

[1] So the facts are given in the "Theological Review," January, 1867, p. 121.

and the other 'narrow.' 'I came here,' he once said to me, 'on the understanding that a man in office may have *any* theology, provided he sticks to his own subject in his class; if the stipulation is to be that a man shall have *no* theology, I am just as much disqualified as you; and the College, instead of respecting conscience, snubs conscience; instead of comprehending everybody, excludes all but secularists.' In his view, either the College had become unfaithful to its professions, or he had mistaken its professions and served it under an illusion; whichever it was, nothing remained for him but to take his leave of it. He resigned his Chair. And though he could ill spare its modest emoluments, he forgot his private loss in the intensity of his public regrets. It is right to add that his judgment on this matter was entirely unaffected by any personal preference. Both candidates were strangers to him in almost equal degree; and the friendly relation in which I stood to him in his declining days had its origin from the issue of this very affair. For aught I know, he may have thought me the less qualified candidate; in that case, he would no less have disapproved of my rejection on any other ground than that of my inferiority.

"The vision of an enlarged sphere of responsibility having vanished, I returned to my 'few youths in a corner' with unabated zeal. Happily, the scale and publicity of life had never been of any importance to me. The interest of my work has lain in its subjects rather than its witnesses or audience; and so long as there was *some* reception or reciprocation of thought to justify a student's enthusiasm, the sympathy of two or three served me as well as that of so many hundreds. As soon as it became evident that the Chair in University College was filled by a thoroughly efficient teacher, I resigned into his hands, with the consent of the Manchester New College authorities, the instruction of our Undergraduate Students."

His feelings at the time are expressed in a letter to the Rev. W. H. Channing: —

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Dec. 14, 1866.

My dear Mr. Channing, — Among the letters from my friends which outweigh all personal disappointment at my rejection by University College, there is not one which carries me beyond the momentary check, and awakens me to new desires of service, as yours. Not that your generous words

beguile me for an instant from my quiet self-knowledge, with all that it contains to sober and humble me; but they faithfully remind me of unaccomplished duties which, be their magnitude ever so small, are of greater worth than I, and confer a privilege wherever they make a claim. I desired this appointment chiefly as an incentive to a proper completion of my work as a teacher. Whether, in default of such constant stimulus, I shall want strength of will to concentrate myself, for what remains of life, on my half-executed designs, I know not. But just now, touched at once by the appeals of friends and by the growing ascendancy of a narrow and ignoble philosophy, I am not without fresh hopes and purposes of self-dedication. The one disheartening feature to me about the recent controversy is, the entire incapacity of such a body of men as the Senate and Council of the University College to appreciate any obligation of *principle* with regard to their trust; their unhesitating readiness to introduce religious disabilities into a College founded in escape from them; and the *rancour* evidently felt by the majority towards any philosophy that can co-exist on the same plane with earnest religious conviction. To an orthodox man, whose mind rents two houses — putting his religion into one and his philosophy into the other — and allows no door between them, they have comparatively little objection; they can have the house that is without a God, just as if the other did not exist, and so get a purely secular teaching, suggestive of nothing beyond the utilities. The distinctness with which this tone of feeling has declared itself has for some time reconciled me to the expectation of a rejected candidature.

In a letter to Dr. Dewey, written before the final decision of the Council, he briefly stated the reasons for his candidature. Dr. Dewey wrote in reply, on Jan. 4, 1867: "What private reasons there may be for your having desired that place in London University — what precisely you mean by 'a somewhat larger sphere and better status' — I do not know; but your position here is worth forty professorships, and I think it must be at home."

The summer of 1866 was spent with his family in Savoy and Switzerland; and in revisiting the country after thirty-two years he "found it not less fresh for being unforgot-

ten, and even more divine for blending the light of past and present." [1]

For a few years, at this period, Mr. Martineau was deeply interested in denominational affairs, and in efforts to realise his aspirations after a larger fellowship than was afforded by any existing sect. The immediate occasion for these efforts was furnished by a notice of motion, given by the Rev. Samuel Bache at the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, in 1865, that the terms "Unitarian Christianity" should be clearly defined. These terms occur in the fundamental Rule of the Association, which was formed "for the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity at home and abroad." It was supposed that these words, which left open an ample field for varying convictions, were sufficiently clear without the interposition of any theological definitions. But a "new school" had arisen, of which Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau were the chief representatives, and which was distinguished by a keener perception of the difficulties created by historical criticism, and by a reliance on the internal rather than the external evidence of the truths of Christianity. With this tendency Mr. Bache had no sympathy, and it seemed to him to be a complete departure from what he had always understood by Unitarian Christianity. In a most courteous letter, dated the 7th of August, and printed in "The Inquirer," he addressed the members of the Association, explaining that his purpose was simply to prevent a theological juggling with words, and expressing his own desire to withdraw, if Unitarian Christianity were so interpreted as to exclude a devout recognition of what he regarded as fundamental doctrines. It might have been thought a simple and logically unassailable thing for any Association to explain its objects to an anxious and scrupulous member;

[1] From a letter to Alger.

but it was generally assumed that Mr. Bache's resolution was virtually an attempt to impose a creed, and to infringe the principles of religious liberty. On this ground he failed to obtain any considerable support, even from those who were in sympathy with his theology. Mr. Tayler's view of what he regarded as a grave crisis is expressed in a published letter of September 3.[1] To this Mr. Martineau replied on September 12: —

"With every word that you say in reference to the movements within our own religious body I heartily and unreservedly concur. I do not suppose that Bache's Resolution will receive any considerable support; his own nearest friends and theological comrades . . . being opposed to him, and complaining of him that he is 'impervious to reasoning.' But the spirit which he has awakened, especially in some of the London ministers, will not be satisfied without attempting in other ways to separate the conservative from the progressive elements in our body. And when I read what Mr. Madge or Mr. Bache have to say on these matters, and observe the limits within which their thought works upon them, and their uncritical assumptions with regard to the historical Scriptures, I am not surprised at their alarm. With a habit of repose on external authority, and a confirmed distrust of the inner and ultimate springs of pious faith, it must be a fearful thing to see what had been taken for material fact dissolve by the infiltration of doubt, or change its form and significance, and borrow all its divine meaning and power from the very conscience and spiritual insight, whose absence it was supposed to supply. It must be confessed that, in their sense, we have no external authority to take the place of what the critic has wrested from the old Protestantism; nothing that can be used mechanically as an oracle, determining doctrine and duty by grammatical interpretation of sentences; and the mass of men are not readily convinced that it would not be a good thing to have such an authority, if it were to be found. Here lies our difficulty, — to lift men into a higher state of mind, and so quicken their spiritual nature as to relieve the need (essentially irreligious) of mere testimonial information, as if the facts of faith belonged to a foreign

[1] See Letters, II. p. 258 *sqq.*

sphere. Did our success depend on this alone, — on our ability to supersede the craving for authority, — I should not be sanguine. But necessity will do for us what would not be yielded to preference. Our cultivated and thoughtful laymen — whether or not they would *like* to rely on prophecy, miracle, and oracle — begin to know that, in the sense and to the extent required, they *cannot*. And whatever their defects may be, they are *veracious* and hate pretence; and will never, I believe, sanction any attempt to divorce religion from the reality of things as God has made them and men may find them. With a secret wish that Mr. Madge's theology were tenable, they will give free scope to ours; and it will be for us to show that the essence of Christianity, the pure power of godliness and righteousness, suffers no detriment, but rather gains a larger range and deeper tone by the inevitable change. For my own part, I can truly say that my reverent appreciation of the personality of Jesus, and the spirit of his life, has risen concurrently with the discharge, by critical process, of a mass of traditional adhesions investing and obscuring the unique and simple figure of himself; and I feel entire trust that other minds, conducted through the same process, will find the same experience. To secure this end, and help the needful transition, without violent break in either the continuity of the old pieties or the recognition of new truth, I am prepared to make any effort with you, or submit to any sacrifice of secondary preferences, which the times or the conditions of effective co-operation may demand. I have small hope of any early widening of the National Church, though that is the end to which I would willingly look. And for generations to come I see no ark of refuge, no retreat for the Christian spirit which is at once catholic and intellectual, but our little Church; and we must keep, if we can, the balance true between the width of its thought and the depth of its devotion."

A few days earlier, September 9, a letter of his was printed in "The Inquirer," replying to some misunderstanding of his position. Among other things, he had been asked to explain on what basis he regarded a Christian Church as standing. To this he answers: —

"As I had occasion to do so, with sufficient explicitness, six years ago, in a pamphlet already quoted ('Church Life? or

Sect Life?'), and see no reason to modify the opinions there expressed, I have delivered my testimony, and have no claim to be heard on this topic again. This only will I add. Every year I more deeply deplore the increasing departure of our religious body from the principles there defended, and its consequent loss of hold on the spiritual and intellectual sympathies of its own best members and of the most promising elements in English society. I believe that by courageously retracing its steps, cultivating its own special inheritance, and ceasing to emulate the sects that live upon the idea of an 'orthodoxy,' it is not too late to recover an honourable, if not distinguished, representative position. But if, in us too, without the excuse of a belief in exclusive 'salvation,' the sense of theological difference has become too strong for the blending power of spiritual affection, — if we cannot kneel and work together without concurrence not only in *what* we trust and worship, but also in the *why* we do so, — then, assuredly, the hour has struck for our dissolution; and not only the outer, but the inner conditions are extinct of all religious action on the world."

The next number of "The Inquirer" contained a long letter from the Rev. P. W. Clayden, at that time the minister of the High Pavement Chapel, Nottingham, earnestly appealing to Mr. Martineau to act as leader along the path which he had indicated, and assuring him that he would have "a following neither feeble nor few." The next week Mr. Martineau replied, explaining his views more fully, but not yet suggesting any definite action. The more important parts of this letter, which is not easily accessible, must be quoted: —

"I do indeed believe it 'not too late to retrace our steps and recover an honourable, if not distinguished, position,' subject, however, to Mr. Clayden's own proviso, '*if we can thoroughly agree upon it and all act in agreement.*' And to secure such agreement I am ready, for one, to join in any action, and make any sacrifices of minor preferences that mutual deference may require. In regard to external relations, we stand at the very crisis of the world most favourable to the action of an undogmatic Church, — a Church unconditionally devoted to the pure Christian pieties and charities. . . . The Church is *the So-*

ciety of those who seek harmony with God; and all who *agree on the terms of that harmony,* so as to seek it in the same way, *belong to the same Church.* Whoever either omits what lies within those terms, or imports what lies beyond them, makes, so far, a false copy of the Divine reality.

"Now the latter of these errors (the error of addition), orthodox Christians commit quite naturally, and with the excuse of unconsciousness. They make doctrinal conditions of membership, because, for them, doctrinal beliefs are indispensable to acceptance with God. Turning to us, who are without those beliefs, they consistently say, 'We cannot own you, for God disowns you.'

"But for us to repeat this error on others is quite unnatural, and without the same excuse of unconsciousness. Not the most rigorous believers among us would say that, for instance, Theodore Parker and his editress had forfeited their divine relations, or were incapable of the noble pieties which link all minds in spiritual sympathy. In shutting out such persons we should, therefore, have to say, 'You will be owned of God, but shall be disowned of us.' . . .

"Whom, accordingly, would I admit to fellowship? All who seek harmony with God and are content with these terms. Whom would I exclude? Absolutely none; leaving the door for ever open, and letting all exclusion be self-exclusion. . . .

"What *name* such a church should assume is less easy to say than what it should avoid. Doctrinal names are from their very nature inadmissible; and any atempt to expel the doctrinal meaning from the word 'Unitarian,' and put in something else instead, would be — without any compensating success — a logical and philological offence of the highest order. The word is exactly fitted for its purpose of theological distinction, and cannot be spared from the vocabulary of opinion; it is wholly unfitted for anything else than theological distinction, and cannot yield such service, however cruelly you strain it on the rack. . . . I refrain from saying more on this point, which needs collective counsel, rather than expressions of individual preference. Its difficulties ought not to be insuperable.

"'But would such a church be Christian?' If by 'Christian' you mean imbued with Christ's spirit, teaching his religion, worshipping his God and Father, and accepting his law of self-sacrifice, this would be the very essence of such a church. . . . With an ever-deepening attachment to historical Christianity, and distrust of philosophical religion apart

from it, I feel all the more absolute necessity of disengaging the spirit from the letter, and of ceasing to prejudge upon sacred grounds literary and scientific questions whose proper evidence is critical, and must await the verdict of the scholar. Depend upon it, the facts of the universe will not prove profane; and, could we know all, we should find in history not less, but more, of God than we had thought.

"One word more. It seems to me, notwithstanding a firm attachment to our congregational independence, that the time has come when it needs to be balanced by a stronger central organisation. 'Independence' is apt, in our smaller and remoter congregations, to mean poverty, desertion, hopelessness; and it ought to be possible, without creating anything like church government, to provide better means of church help. In our external relations, too, we need some authorised representative to speak for us, and knit the ties of sympathy with like-minded churches and sections of churches in other lands. The Unitarian Association, to the extent of its means, has done meritoriously in both these respects; and if only it would make its basis and its name as broad as our old foundations and real character, I, for one, would willingly accept it, with suitable modifications, as our representative. But, as it stands, a large and influential portion of our religious body has never supported it, and never will. . . . If, instead of planning disruptions or standing idly by till the Church of England shall enlarge its bounds to take us in, we could fling our dissensions away, and seize the field left vacant for a Catholic Nonconformity, there is room and opportunity for a Church of simple righteousness, which might stand till its adversaries own it and drop into it."

Mr. Clayden, believing that the time for action had come, conferred with the Rev. Edwin Smith, then resident in Nottingham; and between them they wrote to seventy ministers of their acquaintance, asking them confidentially to express their feeling in regard to a movement in the direction indicated in Mr. Martineau's letter, and stating their conviction that many were "desirous of having some central representative body founded on the broad and unsectarian basis on which" their separate congregations rested. The response was so favourable as to

"startle" even Mr. Clayden; and he then wrote to Mr. Martineau, informing him of the facts, and explaining that what had been done was quite private, and in no way intended to compromise his liberty of action. Some of the letters suggested a private preliminary conference; and Mr. Clayden, accordingly, offered, if Mr. Martineau approved, to invite twenty or twenty-five leading ministers to meet in Nottingham, which he regarded as neutral ground. After some correspondence, Mr. Clayden renewed this offer in a letter written on the 10th of January, 1866. He pointed out, however, that a public exposition of the facts was required, and wrote: "I find many who cannot see at what practical and immediate purpose you are aiming, — and when I have stated as my opinion that the formation of a central union on the basis of our hereditary freedom must be the first outcome of the movement, they have doubted whether you did not contemplate some far larger scheme. It will be a great gain to have it generally understood that this — and only this — is the present practical aim." Notwithstanding these questionings, he added: "I am sure that you will find a response to any definite proposal you make which will surprise you."

As a result of this preliminary correspondence, a prolonged and earnest conference was held privately at Nottingham on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 13th and 14th of March. It was decided by a majority to form a "Free Christian Union," which should serve as a representative organ of congregations that rested on a spiritual, and not a dogmatic basis. The difficulties which were felt by a minority assumed two directions. It was thought that a representative organ, however broadly constituted, would practically emphasise the sectarian separation of the congregations belonging to it and tend to give them an unfavourable view of spiritual life when it appeared under

dogmatic conditions. The other objection was that the term "Christian" was itself exclusive, and associated, in common understanding, with very definite dogmas. These difficulties, however, failed to convince the meeting; and Mr. Clayden and Mr. Edward Enfield were appointed secretaries with a view to further action. The first necessary step was to deprive the British and Foreign Unitarian Association of its representative function, on the ground that being "formed exclusively for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity," it could not represent congregations which inherited "a constitution free from doctrinal restriction"; and before the Conference broke up, a letter was addressed to the Committee of the Association, giving notice of a Resolution to that effect, which was to be moved at the forthcoming Annual Meeting. This was forwarded on the 16th of March to the Rev. R. B. Aspland, the Secretary of the Association. The proposed change, which might seem so far-reaching, was in reality quite insignificant; for the rule, permitting representation, had remained almost a dead letter. A course apparently more conciliatory was, however, adopted at a subsequent meeting. The notice of motion was withdrawn, and Mr. Tayler and Mr. Aspland were requested to move and second a motion appointing a Committee to consider how far the Association could be modified, or to suggest a division of work between two agencies that should co-exist in friendly relations to each other, and to prepare a Report embodying the results of their inquiries.

A manifesto from Mr. Martineau, to prepare the way for the desired change, was published in April in the "Theological Review," with the title, "The Living Church through Changing Creeds." This article explains, first, the broad Christian basis on which most of the congregations now generally known as Unitarian were originally founded, and illustrates their catholicity by some inter-

esting quotations. It enumerates as the three principles of their ecclesiastical life, (1) a basis of union as broad as Christianity; (2) an unconditional refusal of special doctrinal names; (3) an openness to progressive change in doctrine, discipline, and worship. It then describes the gradual growth of Unitarianism, and the application of the Unitarian name to these broad foundations. Referring to the Unitarian Association, it lays down very clearly a distinction to which Mr. Martineau always adhered. He maintained that the limited object of the Association, "the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity," was perfectly legitimate for all individual persons who held Unitarian opinions, and for societies of Unitarian constitution; that the means by which it was pursued were good; and that the name "Unitarian" was exact, and should be freely taken by Anti-Trinitarians to designate their personal belief. On the other hand, it could not represent the old congregations with their catholic latitude; and it was therefore desirable that by a formal act it should renounce its system of congregational representation. The way being thus made clear, it was time to supply the want of a common organ "by forming a Union on principles broad enough to cover the whole area of liberal Christian churches, old or new."

The Annual Meeting of the Association was held at Hackney on Wednesday, the 23d of May. The proceedings were stormy; but it is sufficient to say that Mr. Bache failed to carry his motion, and that the Special Committee was appointed. This Committee met four times, and discussed various plans. Mr. Tayler was in favour of modifying the existing Association by changing the name from "Unitarian" into "Free Christian," and placing on a separate trust all funds expressly devoted to Unitarian objects. Mr. Thom thought the Association could not be so modified as to meet all the wants of liberal Christians,

and proposed a series of propositions, of which the most interesting are these two: "That the Christian Church consists of all who desire to be Children of God in the spirit of Jesus Christ His Son," and "that, therefore, no association for the promotion of a doctrine which belongs to controversial theology can represent the Church of Christ." These several proposals were withdrawn, and the Committee recommended "the friendly co-existence of two agencies with suitable distribution of offices," and that, accordingly, the Association should relinquish the principle of congregational representation. The Annual Meeting, to which the Report containing these recommendations was presented, was held at Brixton on Wednesday, the 12th of June, 1867. After considerable discussion, in which Mr. Martineau once more very clearly explained his position, the Report was adopted; and the ground was now clear for the formation of a new society, which should represent a group of congregations, while the old Association, being composed only of individuals who approved of its aims and methods, should confine itself to doctrinal propaganda.

No time was lost by the promoters of the new scheme. A meeting was held on the following Friday, June 14, at four o'clock, in University Hall, which was summoned "to consider the means of forming a closer union among Liberal Christian Churches and persons for the promotion and application of Religion in Life, apart from doctrinal limitations in Thought." There was a large attendance of Unitarians, and a few Independents also were present, — the Rev. W. Kirkus, of Hackney, and the Rev. Dr. Davidson, late Professor in the Lancashire Independent College, and one Baptist, the Rev. W. Miall, of Dalston. The chair was taken by Mr. W. S. Cookson. Mr. Martineau was called upon to move the first Resolution, which was in these terms: "That whereas religion in its essence

is not contingent upon right opinion on matters of history, criticism, or metaphysics, and in its application to life has become encumbered with a load of superfluous conditions, it is incumbent on those who comprehend it all in the two great affections of love to God and love to man to unite their scattered forces both for closer communion in work and worship, and for resisting every intrusive interference with the intellect and conscience of men." In proposing this Resolution, he gave an account of the movement up to the time of the meeting, and of the object which the promoters had in view; and he declared that they were now in a condition to invite the co-operation of fellow-Christians of other denominations, who were of like mind, and had in fact lost no time in asking for this co-operation. The Resolution was seconded by Mr. Herbert New, and supported by Mr. Kirkus. Mr. Thom, while expressing entire sympathy with the object in view, asked whether it was intended to establish a Catholic *Christian* Church, or a Catholic *human* Church of all who loved God and man, declaring his own readiness to join either union. Mr. Martineau explained that the word "Christian" was not introduced into the Resolution because there were so many definitions of the word, and it was open to so many questions; and if any wished to join the Association who were not prepared to adopt Christianity, he would not shut the door in their faces. The Chairman reminded the Meeting that they had been summoned to form a union of "Liberal *Christian* Churches"; and after some further conversation Mr. Martineau agreed to amend his Resolution so as to include the word Christian. Among others, Mr. J. J. Tayler spoke decisively in favour of defining the Union as "Christian." A few of the speakers believed that this word would necessarily exclude some who were otherwise quite in sympathy with the proposed Union. Mr. Martineau "explained that the Resolution without the word

Christian said everything that it did with the word, and he could not imagine how anyone could assent to the one and yet withhold his assent from the other. But he cared more for the essential religion, and thought it of little importance whether a person was called a Christian or not; and if any were alienated by the introduction of the word Christian, they were alienated by a word without any difference in the reality of the thing. But he granted that they were bound, both by the terms of the circular and by deference to friends, whose co-operation he would not forfeit on any account, to keep the Resolution as it now stood." [1] The Resolution was finally carried, with two dissentients, in this amended form: "That whereas the Christian religion in its essential influence is not contingent upon right opinion on matters of history, criticism, or metaphysics, and in its application to life has become encumbered with a load of superfluous conditions, it is incumbent on those who find its essence in the two great affections of love to God and love to man to unite their scattered forces both for closer communion in work and worship, and for resisting every intrusive interference with the intellect and conscience of men." A consultative Committee was then appointed to lay the scheme before any gentlemen throughout the country who would give it dispassionate consideration.

A pamphlet, entitled "A Catholic Christian Church the Want of Our Time," was published in the autumn by the Rev. J. J. Tayler.[2] This was not avowedly connected with the establishment of the Free Christian Union, but was obviously designed to explain its principles, and recommend their practical adoption. It defended these principles against the two objections, that there can be no

[1] Quoted, with a few verbal corrections, from the Report in the "Unitarian Herald" of June 28, 1867.

[2] The preface is dated November 20.

effective Christianity without a definite dogmatic creed, and, on the other hand, that a Church truly catholic ought not to limit itself to Christianity. It met the latter by pointing out the difficulty of including all the great historical theisms in one religious communion. But, as this was not a practical question, the argument failed to touch the objection which was actually felt.

After full consideration the Committee was prepared to submit a scheme for the constitution of the Society, and on the 21st of November a meeting was held at Freemason's Tavern, Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, at which the Report, containing the Preamble, and a sketch of the proposed constitution and operations of the Union, was adopted. The Report was then printed and circulated. It will be sufficient to quote the Preamble, as constituting its essential part: —

"Whereas, for ages past, Christians have been taught that correct conceptions of Divine things are necessary to acceptance with God, and to religious relations with each other;

"And, in vain pursuit of Orthodoxy, have parted into rival Churches, and lost the bond of common work and love;

"And whereas, with the progressive changes of thought and feeling, uniformity in doctrinal opinion becomes ever more precarious, while moral and spiritual affinities grow and deepen;

"And whereas the Divine Will is summed up by Jesus Christ Himself in Love to God and Love to man;

"And the terms of pious union among men should be as broad as those of communion with God;

"This Society, desiring a spiritual fellowship co-extensive with these terms, invites to common action all who deem men responsible, not for the attainment of Divine truth, but only for the serious search of it; and who rely, for the religious improvement of human life, on filial Piety and brotherly Charity, with or without more particular agreement in matters of doctrinal theology. Its object is, by relieving the Christian life from reliance on theological articles or external rites, to save it from conflict with the knowledge and conscience of mankind, and bring it back to the essential conditions of harmony between God and Man."

The Union was to endeavour to carry out the purposes thus indicated mainly by publications; by bringing together those who sympathised with its catholic design; by encouraging the formation of congregations free from dogmatic restrictions, and helping those already in existence; and by establishing in London a Central Church for the maintenance of Christian worship and life apart from doctrinal interests and names, and open to the services of ministers occupying various ecclesiastical positions.

Mr. Martineau's views respecting the Union at this time are given in the following letters to the Rev. Lewis Campbell: —

10 Gordon Street, London, W. C., Dec. 23, 1867.

Dear Sir, — . . . A sermon of yours preached at Kreuznach which profoundly interested my daughter, and some expressions in your admirable Platonic notes, induce me to think that you may perhaps feel some interest in a movement, recently commenced for a more catholic Christian Union than is compatible with the constitution of any existing church or sect; and I venture therefore to send you a copy of the scheme by Book Post. As a kind of commentary upon it, I will also send, if I can lay my hand upon it, a pamphlet by my friend and colleague, Mr. Tayler. At present the movement meets with sympathy chiefly among liberal members of the Church of England, with whom I heartily wish that theological conviction would allow me to rank myself. But on the Committee are Nonconformist ministers, — Independent and Baptist, — as well as clergymen. Unless some witness is soon borne to the possibility of separating the religious life, not indeed from doctrinal conviction, but from *concurrence* in doctrinal conviction, the spiritual bonds of society itself seem in danger of dissolution.

Believe me, dear Sir,
Yours very truly,
James Martineau.

Jan. 9, 1868.

My dear Sir, — Whatever my regret at your decision, I accept it with unqualified respect for the considerations which influence you. As it rests very much on an estimate of the

forces of liberal opinion which the Union may be able to collect within it, I cannot be surprised that you think we have not yet proved our case. We have certainly very little chance of so wide an operation as either to supersede the sects or to give serious alarm to the Church of England. But short of these vast results, there seems to me, I must confess, a pure and reasonable good to be done, by simply bearing witness, in an age of dissolving creeds and consolidating ecclesiastical pretension, to the ultimate conditions of Christian communion in all their breadth and depth; and by the mere spectacle of men drawing together to own this communion, now and then, across the lines of their hereditary churches. Scattered individuals may doubtless bear their testimony, one by one, to all that is noble and catholic in sentiment; and each may thus work upon his own church in its interior. But it is only by *new combinations* that the possibility can be proved of religious union other and larger than ecclesiastical usage has recognised, and that the vices of our present religious classification can be exposed. For this end it surely does not need that the fresh organisation should be on a scale considerable enough to absorb the sects or bring compunction to the National Church. A clear though small sample embodying the conceptions of earnest men, variously trained, who could hardly be overlooked in any remodelling of religious institutions, could not fail, it seems to me, to fling some better tinge into the future; and this is all that, in these great and slow-paced changes, it is permitted us to hope. No doubt the Church will treat the movement as only the experiment of a new sect. In reference to this objection, Mr. Henry Sidgwick, of Cambridge, wrote the other day that the thing to be shunned was, after all, not a sect, but sectarianism; and that perhaps nothing was more wanted in our age than a sect which, while true to Christian piety, should base itself on the repudiation of sectarianism, and spend its efforts on eliciting the catholic elements of the Christian Religion. That some such need is widely felt is shown by the formation of the Protestantenverein in Germany, and a similar association in France. The "Union," however, may reply to the charge that it disturbs no one's ecclesiastical relations; that it proposes only to bring into clearer consciousness the *common* elements of the Christian life; and that it desires existence only so long as these fail to receive their just recognition.

The sharp distinction which you find in Mr. Tayler's pamphlet between the intellectual and the spiritual I am persuaded

he did not mean to draw. He only thinks that while, to the *individual's spiritual* life, definite *intellectual* belief is highly important, it is not essential, to the common spiritual life of persons worshipping together, that there should be the sort of close *concurrence* in doctrinal belief which the symbolical books of churches are intended to secure. In short, he entirely accepts your own statement, which I read to him, and says that his own idea could not be better expressed.

Forgive my prolixity, and

Believe me ever,

Yours most truly,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

On the 26th of June, 1868, a further meeting was held in Freemasons' Tavern, including not only members of the Union, but others who, amid varieties and changes of doctrinal belief, desired to promote the communion of a common piety and charity. The chair was taken by Mr. Goldwin Smith. The constitution was settled in its final form, some amendments being introduced in order to meet objections which had been expressed; and it was hoped that, in consequence of these changes, there would be a considerable accession to the number of members. The hopes of the founders, however, were not destined to be realised. Though public interest was aroused, and able men belonging to different denominations cordially welcomed the endeavour to establish a wider and more generous communion, objections were raised on all sides, and Mr. Martineau issued a pamphlet early in 1869 to meet these objections, and explain still further the principles of the new society. This pamphlet, entitled "The New Affinities of Faith: A Plea for Free Christian Union," [1] begins by pointing out the dissolution of the old theology among thoughtful men. "It is no longer," says the writer, "an insult to a clergyman's honour, but rather a compliment to his intelligence, to suspect him of saying one thing

[1] Reprinted in Essays, II.

and believing another"; and accordingly the time seemed ripe for new religious combinations. There were three classes of those who suffered from the imposition of articles of belief: those who found the strain put upon their consciences intolerable, and became exiles from all religious association; those who hoped for a reform within their own church; and those Nonconformist congregations in which catholicity was the legal rule and corporate principle, but which had parted with their early promise, and fixed themselves in a doctrinal position. Here he adds a remark, which may perhaps indicate one of the secret sources of failure in the new Union: "Explain it as we may, there would seem to be something transient and incapable of passing into *institution* in the higher action of God's Spirit in history." Still there were many, among those inheriting the traditions of the age of Milton, Hale, and Baxter, who were ready for a religious fellowship not based upon doctrinal conditions, and who might have it in their own worshipping society by simply recalling that society to its half-forgotten catholic basis. It was the purpose of the Free Christian Union to give this larger spirit distinct expression and embodiment. Having then quoted the Preamble, he proceeds to consider objections. The first was, "That, while it denounces sects and disparages doctrine, it proposes to establish a new sect upon a doctrine of its own." This he meets with simple denial, accompanied by the necessary explanations. The next objection was that the Union was so wide that it ceased to be Christian altogether. To this he replies that the universality is inherent in Christianity, and that if Jesus Christ were among us now, he would commune with such men as F. W. Newman and Keshub Chunder Sen. But then came the objection raised by Newman himself, that by being Christian the Union excluded the non-Christian. To this he replies that it is founded on a misconception,

not of the sentiment and principle of the movement, but of its working field. "The Union owns 'spiritual fellowship' with all devout and faithful men, of whatsoever fold; it 'invites them to common action,' each on his own appointed ground, be it Islam, Christendom, Israel, or among the Hindoos; but *its own* object is avowedly 'to relieve the Christian life' from false reliances." This is the gist of the argument, which ought, however, to be read at length to be fully appreciated. It could hardly be expected to satisfy Mr. Newman, one of the lonely thinkers who would gladly have entered into a religious communion that did no violence to his intellectual position. In this personal argument he advances a plea which may reveal another source of weakness in the society: "Mr. Newman thinks it an indispensable condition of a purer religion to remove the authority of Jesus Christ. Many who love and honour him plead for the very same religion on the authority, or as embodied in the life, of Jesus Christ. Surely it is in the interest of their common mission as servants of divine Righteousness and Love that he and they should pursue it with characteristic instruments and separate tracks." This seems clearly to admit that there are sentiments connected with religion which, without being deemed essential to salvation, may legitimately prevent united action; and a Trinitarian, while believing in the salvability of a Unitarian, might say that his own belief in the Incarnation as the central fact in the world's history rendered impossible a union in religious activities. Thus the Union, while theoretically open to all who were animated by the Christian spirit, was practically limited by such theological doctrines as appealed to deep and far-reaching sentiments. But Mr. Martineau believed that "a total change of judgment, equivalent to a religious revolution," was actually taking place, and disposing to "spiritual union" those who could never approach one another

before. This was undoubtedly true, but probably not so widely true as he supposed; and the time had not come when an extensive fusion could take place in immediate answer to even the noblest appeal.

The following letters will further indicate Mr. Martineau's state of mind at this time: —

TO MR. HENRY SIDGWICK.

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Feb. 2, 1869.

Dear Mr. Sidgwick, — I dare not express to you the depth of my disappointment at the two answers from Oxford. On the whole I think it would be better to postpone an application to Professor —— till another attempt has been made at Oxford. . . .

With regard to the pamphlet, I shall be truly obliged by any hint you can give me for its improvement. I have already profited by some friendly criticisms, and am perfectly ready to make any alterations which do not carry the text too far from what is natural to me. And I feel little doubt that you will hit my thought better than I have done it myself. I have not read the proof myself yet, and shall probably find plenty of faults, as I do in all my work.

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Feb. 6, 1869.

Dear Mr. Sidgwick, — I am sincerely obliged by your criticisms, and will briefly report how they affect me.

. . . . . .

I must have expressed myself ill in pp. 20, 21, for I agree with every word of your criticism (up to the last line), only cannot see how it applies. I do not at all intend to imply that, without Piety, Charity is impossible; nor do I advert in any way to the relation between them; which I conceive to be precisely such as you state. The relation which pp. 20, 21 discuss is a different one, viz., that between *both* affections (and indeed all like affections) in their practical expression, and the postulates of belief tacitly involved in them; and my position is that in the practical exercise of these affections men will find their way to mutual trust and communion, if you will let the beliefs play their natural part, without attempting to reduce them to express dogma. In support of this position, I urge that as moral and social life go on health-

ily in the absence of any definition of ultimate ethical principles, so may religious life be left to its own affinities, without need of verbal statements of essentials. Precisely because Worship *does* carry a postulate in it, that postulate is secured in the act itself, and does not want the further guarantee of explicit definition. Religious unity must be based, I think, upon *implicit* and average concurrence, as opposed to *explicit* and selected; and be fostered by devout act and affection in common, rather than by thought. I am convinced that the simplest Theistic definition would raise by its terms scruples enough to dissipate the real agreement among hundreds of persons who, without it, would worship and work together to the end of their days.

Of course it is only to the *corporate* use of dogma that I object. For the *individual* who can think out his beliefs into clear statement, the process may be very important. . . .

I have tried to add a little emphasis to the reasons on which you dwell for using the word "*Christian*," all of which, however, appear to me to be present in the text. It is very probable that my feeling may have run away with me in writing on this subject, and laid me open to just criticism. But, as in all the mixed products of a faulty nature, if the tares are plucked up, the wheat (should there be any) comes with them; so that I must leave it to my readers to bind them in bundles to burn them.

TO REV. W. R. ALGER.

10 GORDON STREET, W. C., March 25, 1869.

MY DEAR MR. ALGER, — . . . During the last two years I have written and lectured more continuously and largely than ever, I think, before. I have just sent you a pamphlet, — "The New Affinities of Faith," — which will show you something of the position of our "Free Christian Union." Whether we shall make way against the curious collection of resisting forces — Christian, anti-Christian, Unitarian-Orthodox, Trinitarian-Orthodox, Broad-Church conformity, Independent-Nonconformists — it is hard to say; but I should not be surprised if our unpretending beginnings, which are watched all round with a good deal of interest, should some day open out into an unexpected magnitude and significance.

The first Anniversary Meetings of the Free Christian Union were held in Freemasons' Tavern on the evenings

of Tuesday and Wednesday, the 1st and 2d of June, 1869. On the former of these evenings there was a public religious service, which was attended by a large congregation drawn together from various sects, and in which the devotional part was conducted by the Rev. W. Miall of Queen's Road Chapel, Dalston, and the Rev. James Martineau, and sermons were preached by the Rev. Athanase Coquerel, of the French Protestant Church, and the Rev. C. Kegan Paul, Vicar of Sturminster, Dorset. The crowded business meeting was held on the following evening, under the chairmanship of the Vice-President, Mr. Henry Sidgwick. The Report of the Committee speaks of "a vast amount of latent approval," but is obliged to note, though without surprise, that "with increasing evidence of extensive concurrence in the principles" of the Union, "they have yet to wait for a corresponding accession of open adhesion," and, "with the small resources at their disposal, they have not been able to enter upon any of the larger methods of action indicated in the original scheme." They find their faith in the principles and aims of the Union "confirmed by the simultaneous appearance of precisely similar organisations in France, in Switzerland, in Holland, in Germany, from all of which letters of cordial sympathy have spontaneously come." The Report closes with a touching reference to the death of the Rev. J. J. Tayler, which had taken place the previous Friday.

To complete the story, we must pass for a moment beyond the limits assigned to this chapter. Notwithstanding the interest and apparent success of these meetings, the Committee met with little practical assistance in their work. The next Annual Meeting was held in University Hall, under the presidency of the Rev. Dr. Sadler, on Saturday, the 25th of June, 1870. The Report of the Committee is marked by a despondent tone. The loss of Mr.

Tayler "had thrown a shadow over the Union, not merely by taking away one whom they all revered, but by depriving them of the counsel and aid which had been of such essential service at every step in its formation." Amid expressions of sympathy, there was a reluctance to work for the objects in view. Even a contemplated volume of Essays had to be abandoned, because men of ability and influence refused their co-operation. In these circumstances Mr. Martineau himself proposed "that in the opinion of this Meeting it is expedient that the Free Christian Union should be dissolved, and that the Committee be instructed to convene a Special General Meeting in accordance with the Constitution of the Union, for the purpose of considering a proposal of dissolution." This motion was carried unanimously; and on the 8th of December the Special Meeting was held in University Hall, and the Union dissolved.

This abrupt collapse of his earnest attempt to lift religion out of its sectarian ruts, and make it wide and free as the kingdom of God, must have brought keen disappointment to Mr. Martineau. Perhaps he despaired too soon; for a movement of such magnitude could not be reasonably expected to succeed in a year or two. Perhaps it rested on too theoretic a basis, and was committed to too elaborate a Preamble, which required a cautious defence against attacks from opposite quarters. Perhaps it sought to combine incompatible objects, originating in a desire to lead back a particular body of Christians to their catholic traditions, and then addressing its appeal to men of various churches who had no hereditary association with that limited group, and but little sympathy with the theology which they had reached. Be this as it may, we may refer here to "The Christian Conference," founded at a later time, which, without a programme or a constitution, has brought together year after

year members of various denominations for a friendly interchange of thought, which has been presided over by Cardinal Manning and by Dr. Martineau, and which has recently brought out a combined volume of Essays by Churchmen and Nonconformists. When we have said that Dr. Martineau was a member of this semi-private Conference, we need not further allude to it.

It is now time to gather up the missing threads of the last few years. In 1867 he spent his summer vacation at Plas Mawr, Penmaenmawr. Here he had opportunities of meeting Mr. Gladstone, of whom he gives the following account in a letter to Mr. Tayler of September 23: —

"During Mr. Gladstone's stay here a good deal of conversation took place, at our occasional meetings, on public affairs, ecclesiastical as well as civil. Though I have the greatest confidence in the nobleness of his impulses, I cannot help wishing that he had thought out into greater clearness the momentous problems with which, in natural course, he will have to deal. I have an impression that, for want of this clearness in his larger personal convictions, he is too much at the disposal of party pressures, or of accidental *bits of clearness* which he gains on parts of great subjects. In particular, I am afraid that the old ecclesiastical theory of the Church, as Trustee of absolute truth, clings to him still; and that, to save it, while recognising the civil equality of all faiths in a nation like ours, he will throw himself into voluntaryism, rather than acquiesce in any Erastian scheme of comprehension. Discussing the proper basis of Church Communion, he quoted, as 'generous though *fallacious*,' Robert Hall's saying, that 'if a man is good enough for Christ, he is good enough for me.' I told him that the generosity of the sentiment blinded me to the fallacy, and asked him to find it for me; as I could not see *who* had a right to make conditions on which God and Christ did not insist. His reply was — what I have heard him say more than once before — that we might indeed have a trust in God's uncovenanted mercies, but must build our institutions so as to include all the conditions (among which is a scheme of dogma) of his covenanted grace. I mention this, not on account of its inapplicability (which is evident), but to show how entangled his mind still

is with the theory of Divine dogma and method that must not be touched. Such a person must keep his Church, and let the State connexion go. I should be glad to be proved wrong; but my fear is that, in this as in other things more purely political, he may drift into American modes of thought."

At this time he was feeling oppressed by a sense of unreality in the use of certain phrases in the volume of "Common Prayer for Christian Worship"; and on the 1st of January, 1868, he submitted to Dr. Sadler a list of changes which he desired to see in any new edition. Dr. Sadler's feeling did not accord with his; and on the 8th of January he wrote again, disclaiming any right to press the alterations. In this letter he explains, evidently in answer to a query of Dr. Sadler's, the reasons which influenced him. He says: "The difference between the phrases at which I stumble and the phrase 'Son of God' is this, — that this last is true to me in its own original Scriptural sense, and I employ it without twist. The former are false to me in their original Scriptural sense, and I cannot use them without consciously perverting them into a meaning of my own, which, if carried into the Scriptures, deprives them of all coherence. In neither case do I care in the least for the 'orthodox' or current understanding of the phrases. It is the rule of *reality*, not of *opinion*, against which I fear to offend." Early in the following year, March 3, he expresses an objection to having two editions, an altered and an unaltered, which would "set the differences side by side, and put them up to public vote"; and he states, moreover, that, if a modified edition were produced at all, he would hardly feel content with the limits under which his proposed list of alterations was formed. Meanwhile he relieved his scruples by writing such changes as he thought desirable in his own copy at Little Portland Street Chapel; and he says: "The difficulty of using the altered book in a con-

gregation having unaltered copies is, I find, purely imaginary. I have had no complaints, and many thanks."

On the 5th of October, 1868, he delivered an Address at the opening of the Session of Manchester New College, in which he spoke "A Word for Scientific Theology,"[1] in opposition to unscientific theologians on the one hand, and the scientific opponents of all theology on the other. He points out that, though they had always been in favour of mixed education, the time had not yet come to dissolve the little dissenting Academy, and send its students for their theology to Oxford and Cambridge; for the Divinity Faculties of these Universities had "to teach up to certain predetermined results," or, in other words, they were there "not to educate, but to arrest education." The Professors in the Academy were to teach whatever they found to be true, "to conduct the student to the present limits of the known and exercise him in the method of advancing them into the unknown." No pledges, actual or implied, were "asked from the Professors, except for the faithful devotion of their faculties, in the respective provinces assigned them, to the search and communication of truth." But this aim was little appreciated, because the English mind was "vitiated through and through by the identification of religion with partizan opinions." In the second part of the Address he deals philosophically with scientific negation, founding his remarks on the Address of Sir Joseph D. Hooker, the President of the British Association, recently delivered at Norwich. It is only just to mention that in a subsequent correspondence Sir Joseph Hooker declares that his views were misunderstood. Mr. Martineau, while thinking that the words were open to the construction put upon them, accepted the disclaimer as an all-sufficient proof that he had incorrectly interpreted their meaning, and expressed his great regret for the involun-

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

tary misapprehension. It is the more important to notice this because, owing probably to a forgetfulness of the correspondence, the incriminated passages in Mr. Martineau's criticism are reprinted without a note in the collected Essays, and no one would regret more than the writer himself that, through any misunderstanding of his, a permanent injustice should be done to the distinguished botanist.

In 1869 we hear for the first time of the Metaphysical Society, which brought Mr. Martineau into friendly contact with distinguished men belonging to widely different Philosophical and Theological schools. An account of its origin will be found in a letter to Mr. R. C. Hall, of March 24, printed at the end of the chapter.

On the 19th of May he preached in Unity Church, Islington, at the Anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. He chose for his subject "Three Stages of Unitarian Theology." [1] The sermon is largely philosophical, and does not easily lend itself to compression; but its general trend may be briefly indicated. It traces Unitarianism to the clearing and defining of the idea of personality, and finds the strength of Unitarian faith in "the impregnable centre of all true religious and moral theory, — that, for all spiritual natures, *Unity* and *Personality* are one." The three stages of this form of theology are presented as Priestley's necessarian type of doctrine, Channing's proclamation of moral freedom, and a combination of whatever truth these opposing systems contain, in a religion of the spirit.

And now a deep sorrow was at hand. His beloved friend, Mr. Tayler, the Principal of Manchester New College, died on the 28th of May. The previous year Mr. Tayler had journeyed into Transylvania to attend the Ter-

[1] Reprinted in Essays, IV.

centenary of the Unitarian Church. The fatigue proved too great for his limited strength, and brought back an internal disease from which he had suffered some years before, and which now proved fatal. This event threw a shade of sadness over the meetings of the Free Christian Union; and on the day succeeding these meetings a sorrowful group of friends and pupils assembled in Highgate Cemetery to commit his body to the ground, while holding his memory in lasting reverence and affection, and with trustful faith following his saintly spirit into a brighter world. Mr. Martineau, notwithstanding his quick and sensitive emotions, had the strength of manly self-control in a remarkable degree, and it was only on the rarest occasions that he did not seem to be complete master of his feelings. But sorrow may have sunk all the more deeply into his heart; and "a certain loneliness of spirit," which had followed him from childhood,[1] would render more painful the absence of a companion on whom he had been accustomed to lean for counsel and sympathy. The reverence directed towards himself by young colleagues could never replace his own reverence and love for the mature and trusted wisdom of the friend who was gone. In a letter to Mrs. T. Smith Osler, Mr. Tayler's daughter, written on June 8, 1878, he says: "Prolonged years have brought me many new friendships; I am grateful for them and rejoice in them. But nothing can compare with the love and reverence that bound me to your father and can never cease to make everything precious to me that recalls his image."

[1] Referred to in a letter to Alger, Sept. 24, 1866.

LETTERS, 1857–1870

TO REV. W. R. ALGER.

10 GORDON STREET, GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.,
March 17, 1858.

I do not believe I ever answered a question put to me in one of your last year's letters, as to the authorship of a paper in the "National" on Baur's theory respecting the Gospels, especially the Fourth Gospel. The article is *not* mine, but my friend's, Mr. R. H. Hutton, of whose productions I not unfrequently get the credit. He is a former pupil of mine, but is one of those deep, fresh, conscientious, and devout thinkers, to whom external influence and instruction only present the occasion and commencement of a noble and independent inward life. On the particular question so very ably discussed in the article on Baur, I find myself unable to agree with him; and I think he has (with Maurice, who has great weight with him) allowed his sympathy with the spirit and doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, — a sympathy which I intensely share, — to affect unduly his judgment on the historical and critical evidence of the book's date and origin. It is a great benefit, however, to have the affirmative case so admirably worked up and exhausted as it is in his paper.

You will perhaps have observed that the fermentation occasioned by our collegiate changes has not altogether subsided. I am happy to say, however, that the absurd personal censorship to which I have been exposed, though encouraged by the Editors of both the "Reformer" and the "Inquirer," is confined to a very small section, and produces no impression. Indeed it has materially aided the determination of the crisis in the liberal direction; honourable and high-minded men, be their opinions "old" or "new," refusing to lend themselves to any personal injustice. No doubt a good deal of the bitterness that has come out is the result of a kind of theological desperation, on the part of men who do not study, and are panic-struck to find the world breaking away from their holdfasts, and moving they know not whither. Those who cannot enlarge their idea of "Revelation," — of "Inspiration," — of the whole relation of God to Human Nature and Human History, — but who stick by the rigid formulas of Judaism, — "the chosen people," "the predicted Messiah," the external

"credentials," the documentary "message," the authoritative "Canon," the "sole rule of faith and practice," — must inevitably be alarmed at the inroads made on all sides by criticism, philosophy, and ethnology on the exclusive claims with which they have unhappily identified their religion. Surely we are passing through all this, with sensible approximation, to a higher conception of Christ and Christianity than has hitherto been found in either the Catholic or the Protestant world. Whether our Unitarian churches will have faith, knowledge, love enough to give it welcome and life with them, remains far from clear.

We watch your Kansas question with great sympathy and anxiety, and note every move it makes. The dreadful oppression of despotism in Europe renders precious every corner of the world where one's brethren are struggling for just rights. It appears as though some great and terrible European movement *must be* near; it cannot be that this incubus, political and ecclesiastical, is to smother out the life of a civilisation so elaborately wrought. Perhaps the sufferings of another revolutionary time may be needed to reanimate the languid soul of faith and arrest the decay of morals (which, I understand, is truly fearful in France under the present *régime*).

Oct. 21, 1859.

The chapter of your forthcoming book is only too tantalising, and I shall say nothing about it till it gets into its proper place; except that so clear and graceful a summary of the grounds of human faith fills one with hopeful expectation of the attendant history. Yet to me there is always something sad in every close critical survey of the actual religious beliefs of mankind, and in every attempt to state their grounds. Compared with one's own sense of those Infinite Realities and one's absolute assurance of them, the mythologic symbols seem so poor and the philosophical grounds so little adequate, that one seems to be drawn into partnership with a pathetic failure; and it takes a little time to recover from the shock and let the native springs of faith resume their play in those depths of consciousness which are beyond our reach and interpretation. Instead of saying with Plato's Roman critic, that whilst the argument goes on, I am persuaded, but when it is passed, relapse into my doubts, I rather feel that the Divine thing is certain until we begin to prove it; and find myself saying "Amen" to the faith, yet picking holes in the dialectic.

Lest I should heedlessly become a receiver of stolen goods, I must correct the impression which I think you have, in common with many friends, that the article in the last "National" but one on Maurice's reply to Mansel is mine. It is by my friend and pupil Mr. R. H. Hutton, who, with his brother, J. H. Hutton, has adopted a belief in the eternal Personality of the Son, under the influence so extensive and deep among the best of our younger generation, of Mr. Maurice's writings. Where this influence operates on the common notional orthodoxy, it is a pure good; and if it were the only channel through which the consciousness could come of a present Divine Life in our humanity, it would be no less good as a change on our prevailing Unitarianism. But to a mind like Mr. R. Hutton's — of vastly more reach and independence than Mr. Maurice's — this consciousness I should have expected to be quite accessible and susceptible of interpretation, without falling back on the old Alexandrine mythology of the eternal Sonship. However, he is a noble-souled and great-thoughted man, — only with a little overbalance on the side of mystical sentiment.

What you report of Mr. Walker's friendly words and the Harvard intentions cannot fail to gratify me deeply, whilst it humbles me with the feeling how little I deserve such generous appreciation. Perhaps it is no sin to set off such things against the corresponding excesses of buffeting and kicks one gets at home, and, whilst they balance one another, sit and work in peace.

TO REV. ORVILLE DEWEY.

10 Gordon Street, London.[1]

Our waning Natural Theology stands greatly in need of such healthy renewal of its force as your strong and lucid thought would give. Between the pantheism of poetical minds and the atheism of scientific, our simple faith in the Living God is driven, by the intellectual spirit of the age, into a despised corner, shunned alike by the reputed thinkers and ordinary worshippers of our day, but still to some few of us serving for philosophy and sanctuary at once. There is something strange in the mutations of belief; they seem to

[1] In this letter, a bit has been cut out, containing the signature and the date, and some other words, which in the copy are filled in by conjecture. The *year* is 1866.

come and go, not by rules of reason, but by seasonal fits of mental temperament and humour. It is said nowadays that theism belongs only to a *little universe*, and that with the extension of the Kosmos in space and time, the idea of Personal Causation must disappear. To me the dictum itself appears absolutely unmeaning and arbitrary; nor can I see in what way the *scale* of a phenomenon affects the spirituality of its cause. It is as conceivable to me that a Will should make a solar system as that it should make a dewdrop; or a forest, as that it should make a tree. But how is it that this fancied discovery — of the incompatibility of Immensity with Personality — has first dawned on this generation? for, whatever may be said of the geological extension of *time* (which, however, has long ceased to be a novelty), the unlimited range of the sidereal universe has been familiar to the imagination of the last century and more, without disturbance to its Natural Theology. The more I study the peculiarities of the simply *scientific* intellect, and the grounds for its favourite dicta, the less favourably do I think of its philosophical depth and breadth, and the more does it seem to me to be at the mercy of a mere narrowness in its verbal formulas and stereotyped conceptions. For a while these causes will, I fear, darken religion as well as philosophy; but the cloud must pass, and the Divine and Human Spirit find each other out again.

TO MR. R. C. HALL.

10 GORDON STREET, W. C., March 24, 1869.

You are the first man I have met with in the younger generation who knows Godwin's "St. Leon," — a book which I have not seen for forty years, and which I have forgotten, as I forget all novels, but which I used to think very powerful. I remember Godwin in his old age; and how I used to feel a kind of sorrow for him that he had committed himself to failure by his answer to Malthus. All his books, however, are interesting as studies of character. And this reminds me of your Emersonian rule, — never to have a book you do not like. There are so many ways, as well as degrees, of liking a book, that I should be at a loss how to apply the rule. I like a book that 's *good to answer* from the clearness and strength with which it puts what I utterly reject (like Mills's "Hamilton"), or a book that 's *good to laugh at*, from its logically deduced nonsense (like Comte's "Catechisme"), almost

as well as a book which speaks home to myself. What indeed would be the plight of a man obliged, like me, to have a *theological* library, if he were insensible to the charms of fallacy and twaddle? You will not persuade me, therefore, to clear the rubbish off my shelves. Every *genus* should be represented in a library; and, most of all, the *largest class*, — as such a radical as you must surely admit. Though not a disciple of Mills's philosophy, I much regret his absence from Parliament; both because he often threw invaluable light upon obscure problems, and because it is good to have the most effective possible expositions of every doctrine and project, whether approvable or not. He is living at Avignon; where, I hear, he has constructed a wonderful mausoleum with grounds around it, to the memory of his wife; and pays a kind of religious homage to her, like that of Comte to the *dried arms* of his M. Clotilde de Vaux. How curiously the religious tendency, drained off in one direction, finds an undercourse, and breaks out at unexpected points! There is a project on foot here, which I think you will regard as a remarkable sign of the times, for forming a Metaphysical Society, devoted especially to the discussion of the ultimate principles of intellectual, moral, and religious belief. Tennyson suggested it and joins it; and Browning, Archbishop Manning, Stanley, Maurice, Sir J. Lubbock, Ward (Editor of the "Dublin Review"), R. H. Hutton, and I are enrolled; and probably the Archbishop of York, Mansel, and the Duke of Argyll, who, it is hoped, will, next month, preside at a dinner arranged for constituting the Society. Was there ever such an extraordinary mixture of people? And apparently one chief inducement to join has been in almost every case the desire to meet men of opposite ways of thinking. I do not know whether the project will really prove feasible; but it has certainly a look of promise. Mill is asked to join; and so are Bain and Tyndall; but I do not know their answer. I would not join, but on condition of their school being distinctly asked.

TO MR. A. J. MOTT.

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Nov. 8, 1868.

I had hoped that, in acknowledging your kind presentation, I might be able to say that I had read your little volume,[1]

[1] "A Man's Belief. An Essay on the Facts of Religious Knowledge," 1868, published anonymously by Williams & Norgate.

and to compare notes with you on the great topics which, as a partial reading already shows, it so thoughtfully discusses. But, being now thrown upon a week especially crowded with occupation, I must content myself with the tender of my thanks. Heartily do I wish that reflecting laymen, who conscientiously qualify themselves to form reasonable judgments on religious questions, would oftener give expression, as you have done, to the conclusions at which they arrive, and the processes of thought by which they reach these. The silence and indifference with which these matters are dismissed to the care of professional theologians are in the highest degree mischievous and disheartening. I like exceedingly the mode in which you approach and take up Christianity, — dealing with it in its realised form as a long-tried fact in the world, and comparing it in its moral results on civilisation with the other great religions of the world; instead of tying it up to any of the distinctive creeds, whether of the first age or of any other. I am convinced that, in no other way can the essential characteristics be reached of that marvellous spiritual influence which has flowed from the personality and life of Christ. The religion is seen better in the Christianity of the latest age than in that of the first.

TO A FRIEND.

10 Gordon Street, W. C., Nov. 7, 1868.

Dear Mrs. ——, — It is natural that those who suffer in your suffering should fly in the eagerness of love to even the faintest and least hopeful promise of inward or outward relief; and so I am encouraged by Mr. —— to give way to my own profound sympathy in a few words; though I know I can say nothing, on the deeper relations of your grievous trial, which has not grown familiar to you in the long watches of thought, and perhaps, with the special insight of the suffering mind, been found empty and unreal. Yet, on the other hand, the intense experiences of life, if they bring flashes of clear truth, are liable also to shut us in amid clouds that hide or distort the real proportions of things and imprison us in a world of their own; so that we lose our proper stay, unless in poignant moments we can rest on the faith of happier and calmer hours. It is from the mutual conference of those who are withdrawn to suffer and those who are left out to act, that the pure wisdom and complete interpretation of life must come. Even then, when you to whom the anguish falls, and

we on whom it is reflected, have told and compared our best thought, it all resolves itself, does it not? into simple trust and love. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in Him." At least when I ask myself *why* this crushing inroad upon the sweetest, purest, most satisfying form of human life? I am lost in the darkness, and dare not pretend to see my way. But the less I can reach the Divine point of view, the more quietly do I subside upon the human, and, in spite of appearances or in impenetrable gloom, give my hand, like a child in the night, to be led by the All-seeing Father, hither or thither as He will. This is not the blindness of mere unthinking faith, rather is it the large willingness to sink the personal point of vision, — even at its fiercest intensity, — in judging of the Infinite, within whose compass I lie, and of whose goodness not my privation, but the plenitude of the whole, is the true measure. Were we able to see the purpose of our sorrows, as we do that of some surgical treatment, the state of mind with which we meet them would surely be unspeakably lowered; prudent and rational endurance for the sake of ulterior advantage would take the place of that confiding piety and utter self-surrender, which, the more it bleeds, the more gives out the hues of every tender and great affection. Alas! dear friend, that the lot of sacrifice should have fallen to you! But what should we be without the biographies of noble suffering? Is there anything so purifying in its search of us, — that sinks the self so low and lifts the soul so high, — as the sight of pain and grief divinely borne? I declare to you, the instances I have seen or known of such lives, — including yours, — haunt me as a perpetual presence, and mingle tender and sacred undertones with the superficial voices of daily duty and of natural joy. That the chords which give forth such music for humanity should thrill with anguish in the striking is indeed a pathetic necessity; but the very pity of it, burning down into the heart of us, comes in contact with all the love and reverence we have, and kindles them into an enveloping passion. The really perplexing cases are those in which suffering seems to spread in circles of *moral* deterioration in the minds of patient and of observers; not those in which it deepens, refines, and strengthens, and like the lightning, while it blasts a single tree, quickens the whole forest into green. I cannot but have faith that your children, however sadly bereft of your personal care, will be educated by your image and memory to a form and stature of character which no days of happy care could give. But this is a

thought which comes too near to *finding reasons;* and I dare not pretend to them; but rest simply here; — that if only we can give ourselves up *in trust,* and the more we are stricken by the hand, fly the more closely for refuge to the heart, of the All-loving God, there is no pain or terror which will not work itself clear out of the cloud into higher glory. I do not forget how often the problem of suffering is solved by saying that we have to bear it as the *penalty of sin;* but no personal appropriation of this thought can reasonably be made by innocent and dutiful lives, though doubtless, in an indirect and circuitous way, it hits a truth. Certainly the physical condition of us all carries in it the entail of a long past, and is, as it were, the vital record of moral order or disorder both in earlier generations and in ourselves. Had all been invariably right there, many a transmitted weakness would have been spared, and from faultless antecedents would have come to us a more painless life. And when we rise to a perfect administration of our human trust, its natural functions, we must believe, will gain comparative immunity from their present terrible liabilities. So far, it must be owned, we suffer as members of a moral organism, — of a united family, — where the sin, and even the mistake, of each becomes the sorrow of all. But, except when we smart from the effects of our own personal transgression, this truth seems empty of any immediate lesson, either of comfort or of self-reproach, to our hours of pain. What can we do with the sins of our fathers, or with our own that are left behind, except take care not to repeat them? and this is a lesson rather for action than for endurance. It only compels me to feel, — what is no doubt wholesome when I am calm enough to think of it, — that I am not all my own, but am woven into a social texture, where, in every fibre of my being, I must give and take of the life that passes through the whole. Seven years, dear friend, if I mistake not, you have been laid low, and passing through what none can tell. Even to our outside reckoning it is a large segment from our little round of time; and from the interior, the hours of suffering seem endless, — a weary and waste eternity. Well, the more they use up of this life the more do they bespeak another; and by breaking off our promise so near its beginning, reserve the more for its heavenly end. You know how little you have exhausted the capacities of your nature; at what a stage of growing thirst — in thought, affection, aspiration — you have been brought to pause; and how time alone and scope, perhaps denied you here, are needed to fulness of

spiritual power, and to the attainment of those supreme ends which would never be ideally given us except as steps and incitements to their realisation. Rightly to appreciate the measure of our spiritual nature is to discern at once the prospective attitude of life, and see in it but the first act of a larger drama. What its ulterior scenes may have in store for us, it were presumptuous to surmise, beyond simply this: — that the broken thread of our personal existence will be taken up, and the continuity of faculty and discipline renewed. Here we have been called, by secret insight and irrepressible aspiration, to resist external tyrannies, to work out our best thoughts, to make, in our small measure, a divine poem of our life. But, ere we have gone far, — with only a few stanzas which we meant to revise and sweeten, — the moulding hand is struck down, and the fragment stops in the middle of a line. When we wake to it again with brighter thought, it must surely be to weave it on whence it was left off; to carry out its pervading idea, with the same intellectual materials, and the same lights and shadows of love, and to give it movement amid the same personal relations, which supply its actions and make music of its rhythm here. In short, a soul that is the same must have a life that is the same, and over no thought that is true, no affection that is pure, no piety that is trustful, can Death have any power. Though we know no more, here let us rest. Often, — as even the unsuffering find, — the love of God is hid, — passes behind the cloud and leaves us with a cold shudder of alarm, as if it were not there. But the Divine realities do not depend on our apprehension of them; the eclipse of our vision makes no difference to their shining, except to us. The Infinite Love abides behind, and waits till we return to it, and the intercepting veil falls away. At times, I think, when the mists of fear and distrust gather round the heart, it is even better to forget Him till He finds us again, and say: "I will possess my soul in patience," than to accuse either Him or oneself of deserting a relation which is suspended, it may be, only to be more closely bound. I can say no more, and this is nothing. Faint on, dear friend; if the cross is heavy, it is not far to Calvary, and then the sacrifice is soon complete.

Ever with true sympathy, yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

TO MR. HENRY SIDGWICK

TO MR. HENRY SIDGWICK.[1]

10 Gordon Street, W. C., March 18, 1870.

My dear Mr. Sidgwick, — I have read and re-read your Essay with the greatest interest, and think it impossible that a difficult question of casuistry should be more subtly or more fairly argued. The pamphlet will assuredly give, from an interior and sympathising point of view, true direction to many perplexed consciences among the clergy, and valuable suggestions of reform to laymen who are in earnest in ecclesiastical affairs. I cannot conceive that our Committee will have a moment's hesitation in thankfully adopting it.

In proportion, however, to your success in proving the incompatibility of a fixed liturgy with an unrelaxed clerical sincerity, is my doubt whether the former is worth retaining at the cost of the latter; and I confess I have never felt so shaken in my nationalism as by your paper. No reasoning — though I own its force — avails to take away my sense of guilt from recited prayers which I do not pray; nor can I help feeling that a service inevitably involving this condition is self-condemned. The free prayer of Scotland and the Continental Protestant churches escapes this difficulty, but affords no protection to the congregation against the idiosyncrasies of the minister. I would rather forego, however, doctrinal protection than ministerial sincerity. Without absolute trust in the pure earnestness of their prophets, the people will be unsusceptible of religious impression from their ministrations. And hence in part, and not only from fear of ecclesiastical consequences, arises the *suppression* of clerical free thought. If your rule of frank confession of divergence were acted on, the gain to the conscience of the teacher would be countervailed, I think, by inevitable forfeiture of religious power. The sacrifice incurred for the sake of Nationalism would drive all the popular fervour and much of the spiritual purity of the country into voluntary organisations, which, at least for a time, would give them freer scope and firmer trust. Published Casuistry must — from the very nature of religion — be the ruin of any Church. It cannot cease to be the clergyman's instinct to conceal his theological struggles, if he has them. If he avows them, he may be a helper of thought, and

[1] This letter apparently refers to the manuscript of Mr. Sidgwick's essay on "The Ethics of Conformity and Subscription," published by the Free Christian Union. For that reason it is printed here, notwithstanding its date.

a check on fanaticism and intolerance, and may render a thousand useful services; but his normal function can hardly fail to be impaired.

I am not quite sure, however, that the deviations of individual opinion from the prescribed standards of worship need be so sensible as you suppose. If the common liturgical basis is reduced to the simple ground-work of Christian Theism, and if then provision is made for the filling-in of this outline by supplementary elements, changeable with place and time, it would seem not impossible to meet a wide variety of wants, without oppressing any conscience which feels the need of worship at all. I fear it is too late for such a revolution. But unless the picture be drawn, the chance of its realisation is thrown away.

TO REV. J. H. THOM.

10 Gordon Street, Dec. 5, 1857.

I heard Maurice for the first time last Sunday, and was astonished at the *power* of his preaching. I always imagined that the Sermon was the least part of the interest in the services of Lincoln's Inn Chapel and was somewhat faint in manner and difficult to seize. But we heard a broad, distinct, and vigorous sermon, direct in its doctrine and solemn in its applications, on the *perpetual* advent of the Son of God (it was Advent Sunday) for the continuous redemption and continuous judgment of humanity in its conscious relations to a Holy God. But for a slight remnant of Church monotony, there would be nothing to remark in his manner but its earnest simplicity. I dare say, however, you have often heard him.

. . . . . .

I find my work at present extremely severe, involving longer and later hours and a more constant strain than I have ever known. But I am well and hopeful and time will somewhat relieve the stress.

10 Gordon Street, Gordon Square, London, W. C.,
Jan. 30, 1858.

Have you seen F. W. Newman's curious new book — "Theism"? If not, you must get it and read it; though its form, I suspect, will annoy you not less than it does me. I tried hard to persuade him out of it, and speak to us in his beautiful prose; but nothing can move him from these

eccentric fancies. Beneath the form, however, there lies great depth and beauty of truth, exhibited often through a medium of most lucid exposition. To the one half of the great religious problem of our age — the *historical* revelation of God — he turns still a blind side. The other half — the carrying of our cardinal faiths home to their seats in human nature and finding their justification and meaning there — he appears to me often to touch with a hand of masterly experience. The piece "God in Conscience" impresses me deeply as a powerful exposition. But the curious intertwining, as it were, of logical intellect with tender affections and fine conscience, mediated and harmonised by no ideality to blend the whole into one pattern, is more apparent in this book than in any of his former ones. *Frankly* he seems to me to be purer and more winning every year.

10 Gordon Street, London, W. C., Dec. 31, 1859.

I owe you thanks, dear friend, that cannot be paid, for your precious volume recently published.[1] I have yet to read the last two sermons. But the others speak, to my apprehension and sympathies, the deepest essence of our religion, in tones at once most wise and beautiful. I wish I could believe that they would meet response as complete as they ought to find among our people. But upon many minds outside, and certainly not a few within our churches, their impression will be deep and strong.

[1] "The Revelation of God and Man in the Son of God and the Son of Man."

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co.
Edinburgh & London

A SELECTION FROM

JAMES NISBET & CO.'S

List of New and Recent Publications

Imperialism. A Study

By J. A. Hobson, Author of "The Social Problem," "The War in South Africa," etc., etc. With Maps and Diagrams. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

Mr. Hobson's book is a spirited treatise on what he conceives to be the tendencies of latter-day Imperialism, and a careful examination of its aims and its results. He writes as an economic observer as well as a politician, and his arguments will probably be thought worth consideration even by those who differ from the conclusions he suggests.

Letters of Emilia Russell Gurney

Edited by her NIECE. Demy 8vo, 12s. 6d.

Mrs. Russell Gurney will long be remembered by all who knew her, not only as the wife of a distinguished man, but as a woman who combined great cultivation and social charm with a deep and vivid feeling of religion. Her letters to her many friends, collected in this volume along with some record of her life, are remarkable for their biographical interest, for the spirit they show and for the counsel they convey.

Bolingbroke and His Times

The Sequel. By WALTER SICHEL. With several Illustrations. Demy 8vo, 12s. 6d. net.

"His aim really is to make a complete picture and he undoubtedly succeeds."—*The Times.*

"Mr. Sichel has produced a work at once erudite and brilliant, which will take its place among the best political biographies in our language."—*The Speaker.*

"Mr. Sichel has unquestionably done great service to Bolingbroke and to his reputation, which he may be said to have resuscitated and reconstructed."—*The Globe.*

"A brilliant book."—*The Academy and Literature.*

The Story of Westminster Abbey

Being some account of that Ancient Foundation, its Builders, and those who sleep therein. By VIOLET BROOKE-HUNT, Author of "Prisoners of the Tower of London," "Lord Roberts," etc. With 32 Illustrations and Plans. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

"Really, it is no inconsiderable task to tell the whole of England's history in a chain of biography with links of death; but the author has succeeded admirably."—*The Academy and Literature.*

"It possesses the merits of a guide-book combined with the charms of a romance."—*Journal of Education.*

"The book is written with picturesque sensibility, and besides giving an account of the ancient foundation and the men who built and enriched its walls and shrines, it does justice to the poetry of association of a church which as far back as the days of Edward IV. was described as a sanctuary 'placed before the eyes of the whole English world."—*Standard.*

"Brightly written and charmingly illustrated."—*Manchester Courier.*

A Faithful Sower

A Sketch of the Life of the late Rev. George Everard, M.A. By his DAUGHTER. With Portrait Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

[*Second Edition now ready.*

"No one, indeed, can read it without feeling that the life-story of Mr. Everard is an inspiration to follow his bright example of unselfish devotion to Christian work."—*Record.*

Novels and Stories

Poor Sons of a Day

By ALLAN MCAULAY, Author of "The Rhymer," etc. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

Allan McAulay, whose historical novel dealing with the life of Robert Burns lately attracted so much attention, has here taken a higher flight. His new romance contains a striking picture of Charles Edward Stuart and the rising of "the '45." The subject is treated with a fulness of knowledge which makes the historical portraits singularly accurate and clear; and a charming story of Scottish life in the eighteenth century provides an admirable setting for a fine historical romance.

The Work of Oliver Byrd

By ADELINE SERGEANT, Author of "The Story of a Penitent Soul," "The Treasure of Captain Scarlett," etc. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

Miss Sergeant is a veteran novelist whose latest novel is distinguished by all the qualities which have made her work successful for several years past.

Cashiered, and other War Tales

By ANDREW BALFOUR, Author of "By Stroke of Sword," etc. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

"No one will complain of dulness in these capital stories."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

"It strikes us that these energetic, workmanlike sketches, popular in sentiment and quick in action, are the best of their kind."—*Bookman.*

"He writes vividly, with a full appreciation of the value of dramatic incident."—*Daily Telegraph.*

A Dream's Fulfilment
and other Stories

By Mrs. WALFORD, Author of "Mr. Smith," "The Baby's Grandmother," etc. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

This volume of short stories shows Mrs. Walford's power of story-telling at its best.

The Story of a Mother

By JANE H. FINDLATER, Author of "The Green Graves of Balgowrie," etc. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

"A book by a genuine artist such as Miss Findlater comes as a real *bonne bouche* to the reviewer."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"The book is worth reading and will not be easily forgotten."—*The Speaker.*

"Miss Findlater displays the delicacy of the true artist."—*Illustrated London News.*

Theological Works

The Coming Revival

A new Devotional Volume by the Rev. ANDREW MURRAY, Author of "Abide in Christ," etc. Crown 8vo.

The Gist of the Lessons for 1903

By R. A. TORREY. Long pott 8vo, 1s. net.

Admittedly the best guide published to the International Sunday School Lessons.

"Come"

A Selection of Gospel Hymns. By Mrs. BEVAN, Author of "Hymns of Ter Steegen and Suso," etc. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

The Utmost Bound of the Everlasting Hills

By the Rev. A. R. MACDUFF. Illustrated. Extra crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

The Church Directory and Almanack for 1903

Third Year. Revised and Enlarged, with many additions and new matter. 2s. net; or in cloth cover, 3s. net.

"A new venture which says much for the enterprise of its publishers, and the diligence of its editor."—*Times.*

"A boon which will be welcomed on all sides, and will at once make a place for itself amongst the recognised books of reference."—*Record.*

JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED
21 BERNERS STREET, LONDON, W.

BINDING SECT. NOV 2 _ 1966